

THE TWO SEEDLINES

by

Willie Martin

In the oldest writing in Scripture, we learn from the book of Job, "And the Lord said to Satan, From where do you come? Then Satan answered the Lord and said, From roaming about on the earth and walking around on it." (Job 1:7)

Satan was forced out of heaven and henceforth lives on the earth. Peter confirms this in the New Testament: "Your adversary, the devil, prowls about like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour." (1 Peter 5:8)

There are some who say the angels nor Satan could procreate. But where is this stated in the Scripture? The only reference that is made about those in heaven is where it is related that men and women are not given in marriage: Matthew 22:29-30: "Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." (KJV)

Mark 12:25: "For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." (KJV)

Luke 20:34-35: "And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage." (KJV)

There is not one word in any of these verses which say that they could not procreate if they wanted to. Only that they are not given in marriage, nor do

they marry. Therefore, it is safe to assume that they could have children or procreate if they wanted; but apparently the desire to have sex will have been taken from them. Therefore, those who base their belief that an angel or a spirit or whatever could not procreate is false; and not proven in the scriptures.

Now let's take a look at Fallen Angels as the Scriptures refer to them.

Angels, Fallen: Heavenly beings or divine messengers created by God who rebelled against Him and were cast out of heaven. The lord or prince of these fallen angels is Satan (Revelation 12:7-9). Fallen angels, or messengers, continue to serve Satan; but their power is limited. Judgment awaits them in the future (Matthew 25:41; Revelation 12:9). The fallen angels referred to in (2 Peter 2:4) and (Jude 6) are possibly the beings referred to as "sons of God" in (Genesis 6:1-4). There is no real distinction between fallen angels and Demons. (from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) (Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

Angels, Fallen?

ANGELS, FALLEN. Besides the good, elect, and unfallen angels two classes of fallen angels exist:

1). The angels who are unimprisoned and follow Satan as their leader. These apparently are identical with the demons (which see). During the Great Tribulation war will ensue between "Michael and his angels" and "the dragon and his angels" (Revelation 12:7). The dragon will be cast out of the heavenlies upon the earth and his angels with him (Revelation 12:8-9). These are remanded to the abyss at the second coming of Christ (Revelation 20:1-3) and consigned to the lake of fire after their final postmillennial revolt (Matthew 25:41; Revelation 20:10).

2). The angels who are imprisoned are the more wicked spirits that did not maintain their original estate "but abandoned their proper abode," being "kept

in eternal bonds under darkness" awaiting judgment (Jude 6; 2 Peter 2:4; 1 Corinthians 6:3). Many Bible teachers hold that they include the fallen angels that cohabited with mortal women (Genesis 6:1-2) and were imprisoned in the nether world as a special punishment for their crime of breaking through God-ordained orders of being. (m.f.u.) (from New Unger's Bible Dictionary) (originally published by Moody Press of Chicago, Illinois. Copyright (C) 1988.) Angels: ("messengers"). Often with "of God" or "Jehovah" added. Sometimes called the "holy ones," "saints." The "Angel of God" often means the Divine Word, "the Image of the invisible God," God Himself manifested (Colossians 1:15; Genesis 22:11-12; 16:7,13; 31:11,13; 48:15-16; 33:14; compare Isaiah 63:9; Exodus 3:2,6,14; 23:20-22; Acts 27:23-24, compare Acts 23:11; Numbers 22:22,32,35); accepting as His due the worship which angels reject as mere creatures (Revelation 19:10; 22:9); this manifestation was as man, an anticipation of the incarnation (John 1:18; Genesis 18:2,22; 19:1; 32:24,30; Joshua 5:13,15) ... **SEEMINGLY BUT NOT CERTAINLY IMPLY THEIR HAVING BODIES. THEIR GLORIOUS APPEARANCE (Daniel 10:6), LIKE OUR LORD'S WHEN TRANSFIGURED AND AFTERWARD AS THE ASCENDED SAVIOR (Revelation 1:14-16), AND THEIR HUMAN FORM (Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10),** favor the same view. Close kindred of nature between angels and men is implied in both being alike called "sons of God" (Job 1:6; 38:7; Daniel 3:25,28) and "gods" ([^alohiym (heb 430)]) (Psalm 8:5; Hebrew [^alohiym] "angels," Psalm 97:7; Luke 3:38) ... As finite, and having liberty, they were capable of temptation. Some "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1:6) ...

"When man fell by evil angels, with beautiful propriety it was ordered that other angels, holy and unfallen, should minister for God in His reparation of the evil caused to man by their fallen fellow spirits. They rescued at Jehovah's command righteous Lot from doomed Sodom, Jacob from his murderous brother (Genesis 19; 32) ..." (from Fausset's Bible Dictionary)

We can see from these few Bible Commentaries and Bible Dictionaries that the angels can have human bodies and can come in unto the women and subvert them, or beguile them as one of them did Eve.

Other Scriptures in both the Old and the New Testaments tell further of Satan's activities, his authority and powers, and his final destruction. For our purpose, the Scriptures used here suffice to establish the advent of Satan on earth somewhere before Genesis 3:1. Even though it was not reported here, other scripture references give ample evidence that the event most assuredly took place.

This is a prime principle which we must acknowledge and accept, that the whole of Scripture testifies to all parts of Scripture. This principle is clearly evident in the case of Satan's advent; it is evident and necessary in other cases which we shall soon see.

There is an all-out war of words being waged in the circles of the Israel Truth, otherwise known as the Israel Identity. Parties on both sides of the issue have drawn a line in the sand, and ideological clenched fists are being shaken from indignant participants.

Each participant, in his own way, is trying his best (or maybe his worst), in the most brutal manner, to draw ideological blood. They are aiming their rhetorical cutting words for no less than the proverbial jugular vein of their opponents in order to kill what they believe are damming heretical influences.

Both sides go to long and contentious lengths in an attempt to prove their undying convictions on this subject. To these opposing adherents, there is no common middle ground for compromise, nor can there ever be any. This is a matter where one is either totally correct or totally wrong; no gray middle areas.

Many simply do not have a complete knowledge of this subject, but will find themselves eventually, on one side of the fence or the other. If one tries to straddle the fence on this subject, he will only find himself with his pants torn, and espoused in the most unseemly location.

Like all controversies, there is usually a right and a wrong side to consider. And of course the Jews are throwing in their provocateurs to cause continued friction between the two sides, to the point that neither side will relent even a little in their core beliefs. In this study we will be considering who is wrong on this **GREATEST OF ALL ISSUES**, at least some believe that it is the greatest of all issues.

The concept of the Two Seedlines is; that Satan once ruled to a high degree in the dimensions of Yahweh. In ages past, not being satisfied with his high position, he tried to usurp the position of Yahweh Himself. Satan (the shining one) "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." (2 Corinthians 11:14) convinced 1/3 of Yahweh's angels to join him in his rebellion. This rebellion is recorded in Revelation 12:7-9: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was **THEIR PLACE** found any more in heaven. And **THE GREAT DRAGON** was cast out, **THAT OLD SERPENT, CALLED THE DEVIL, AND SATAN**, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." If you will notice very carefully, if you have a KJV with a good center reference (cf. Older World, Southwestern or newer Zondervan Classic) this verse takes you to Genesis 3:1, 4 (2 Corinthians; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6; Revelation 12:9), so there is no doubt here who the serpent of Genesis is. If you don't understand this connection with the above quoted passage and the **SERPENT** of Genesis 3:1, 4, you will have totally lost sight of the entire story. Yeashua the Messiah, being Yahweh incarnate, speak is of this, Satan's fall, in Luke 10:18: "... I 'beheld' Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

This is past tense; not something in the future. Beheld: Strong's Concordance: #2334 theoreo (theh-o-reh'-o); from a derivative of 2300 (perhaps by add. of 3708); to be a spectator of, i.e. discern, (literally, figuratively [experience] or intensively [acknowledge]): KJV-- behold, consider, look on, perceive, see. Compare 3700. Lightning: Strong's Concordance: #796 astrape (as-trap-ay'); from 797; lightning; by analogy, glare: KJV-- lightning, bright shining. Fall: Strong's Concordance: #4098 pipto (pip'-to); a reduplicated and contracted form of peto (pet'-o); (which occurs only as an alternate in certain tenses); probably akin to 4072 through the idea of alighting; to fall (literally or figuratively): KJV-- fail, fall (down), light on.

Christ said: "Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it, said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him. Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes. Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (John 12:28-31; Luke 10:18; John 14:30; 16:11; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Ephesians 6:12) (KJV)

The concept of the Two Seedlines further predicates that when Satan fell, with the rest of his satanic beings, they left the dimension of spirit and entered the dimension of the physical, as men: "And **THE ANGELS WHICH KEPT NOT THEIR FIRST ESTATE**, but left their own habitation (or principal it, KJV center reference), he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day (no longer having access to Yahweh's dimension)." (Jude 1:6)

We know these fallen angels were living at the time of Yeashua as men, as the center reference of the KJV takes us to John 8:44 where Yeashua said to the "Jews": "**YE ARE OF YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL**, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." (John 8:44; see also (Matthew

3:7; 11:12; 12:39; 12:45; 23:15; Luke 9:41; 10:25; Acts 1:6; 2:40; 13:6-10; Romans 2:14; 4:15; 7:7; 1 John 3:4; 3:10)

Another cross reference on Jude 6 is 2 Peter 2:4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains (earth bound) of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."

The fallen angels had the power to change themselves into the form of men is recorded in "The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden." In "Testament of Reuben," 2:18-19, page 223: "For this they (the women) allured the Watchers (fallen angels) who were before the flood; for as these continually behold them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; **FOR THEY CHANGED THEMSELVES INTO THE SHAPE OF MEN**, and appeared to them when they were (possibly not) with their husbands. And the women lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven." With this exceptionally outstanding passage, we can more wholly comprehend what it means in Jude 6, the fallen "angels which kept not their first estate." This passage also serves as a paradigm or model, after the fact, of what happened previously involving the satanic seduction of Eve in the garden of Eden. We are now more aware of the war which resulted in the fallen angels becoming earth bound or "chained,," which is an essential element in the concept of the Two Seedline doctrine.

Now that we know who the players are, let's proceed with the narrative which resulted in the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 It is simply amazing the various unreasonable, preposterous, nonsensical and twisted arguments that opponents of the Two Seedline teaching advance to secure their groundless, unfounded and insecure positions. We will be getting to examples of some of them shortly, after we briefly walk carefully, step by step, through the fundamental story.

NOW MAKE NO MISTAKE, WE BELIEVE SINCERELY THAT THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD WITH THE TWO SEEDLINE THEORY ARE SINCERE AND FAITHFUL MEN OF YAHWEH. WE JUST DISAGREE WITH THEM AND BELIEVE THAT THEIR TEACHING IS IN ERROR; AND NOT DELIBERATELY FALSE TO DECEIVE.

In Genesis 2:16-17 we see where Yahweh instructs Adam before the creation of Eve. You see, there was already a danger that Adam might mess up by eating of the forbidden fruit, the mixing with the other races which had been created before Adam was **FORMED**, even before Eve arrived on the scene. The important thing to see here is, Yahweh had a very important reason for instructing Adam at this time, for there were a lot of women unlike his kind (pre-Adamites; A book entitled, "Preadmites," or a demonstration of the Existence of Men Before Adam; together with a study of their condition antiquity, and Racial Affinities, and Progressive Dispersion Over the Earth, by Alexander Winchell, LL. D., and published by S.C. Griggs and Company, London: 1880, which contains 500 pages.

Another book entitled, "Adam and The Adamite" or, The Harmony of Scripture and Ethnology by Dominick Meausland, Q.C. LL. D., London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington St. England 1864) running around the garden to excite his natural manly instincts).

"And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Genesis 2:16-17)

The rest of Chapter 2 concerns itself with the creation of Eve, an "help meet" for Adam who was genetically the same as he was, or as Genesis 2:23 expresses it: "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man." (Genesis 2:23)

You will notice a good cross reference system of the KJV (as stated before) gives Ephesians 5:30 on this verse and says: "For we are members of his (Yeashua's) body, of his flesh and of his bones (same race)."

To further establish the setting or background surroundings of this story, it will be needful to consider Genesis 2:8-9: "And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil (three kinds of trees in all)."

We have to look for something here that has the knowledge of good and evil. This knowing good and evil is the **EARMARK** of angels. Therefore, this tree that has the knowledge of good and evil must be an angel of some rank. If Revelation 12:9 is true, he is the original organizer of the rebellion in heaven, the old serpent himself.

For proof that angels have the knowledge of good and evil, let's look at 2 Samuel 14:17: "Then thine handmaid said, The word of my lord the king shall now be comfortable: for **AS AN ANGEL OF GOD, SO IS MY LORD THE KING TO DISCERN GOOD AND BAD**: therefore the LORD thy God will be with thee." (KJV) "And now your servant says, 'May the word of my lord the king bring me rest, for my lord **THE KING IS LIKE AN ANGEL OF GOD IN DISCERNING GOOD AND EVIL**. May the LORD your God be with you.'" (NIV)

We also would direct your attention to the following verses: "To fetch about this form of speech hath thy servant Joab done this thing: and my lord is wise, **ACCORDING TO THE WISDOM OF AN ANGEL OF GOD, TO KNOW ALL THINGS THAT ARE IN THE EARTH**." (2 Samuel 14:20)

"And he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king; but my lord the king
IS AS AN ANGEL OF GOD: do therefore what is good in thine eyes." (2
Samuel 19:27) (JV)

Now that we understand that THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD and
EVIL and THE SERPENT are the same thing, we are in a better position to
understand who the players in this episode are. Now let's see what Genesis
3:1-3 says: "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which
the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said,
Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the
serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of
the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of
it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." (KJV)

"Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field which the LORD
God had made. And he said to the woman, "Indeed, has God said, 'You shall
not eat from any tree of the garden'?" And the woman said to the serpent,
"From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; but from the fruit of the
tree which is in the middle of the garden, God has said, 'You shall not eat from
it or touch it, lest you die.'" (NAS)

"Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the LORD God
had made. He said to the woman, Did God really say, 'You must not eat from
any tree in the garden? The woman said to the serpent, We may eat fruit from
the trees in the garden, but God did say, You must not eat fruit from the tree
that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die."
(NIV)

The KJV center reference says, you will find the SERPENT of Genesis 3:1 is
the same SERPENT of Revelation 12:9 that organized the rebellion against
Yahweh.

If you will notice again, it also indicates the SERPENT of Genesis 3:1 is the same SERPENT of 2 Corinthians 11:3 which reads: "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ (Yeashua)." (KJV)

Right away the opponents of Two Seedline doctrine are going to moan and groan, and say something like this, this passage is speaking of mental seduction only. Let's see if this supposition is true. Remember, this was the warning!: "But of the fruit off the tree which is in the midst of the garden Yahweh hath said, Ye shall NOT EAT OF IT, NEITHER SHALL YE TOUCH IT, lest ye die."

What was it that Eve did EAT?, and What did Eve TOUCH?

The word "eat" in the Hebrew is, #398, akal, to eat; also, to lay with. Eat: Strong's Concordance #398 'akal (aw-kal'); a primitive root; to eat (literally or figuratively): KJV-- X at all, burn up, consume, devour (-er, up), dine, EAT (-er, up), feed (with), food, X freely, X in ... wise (-deed, plenty), (LAY) meat, X quite.

To prove that many times this is so, we will use some examples from Scripture. First we will use a supporting Scripture, Proverbs 30:20: "Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she EATETH, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness."

"And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did EAT, and bowed down to their gods." (Numbers 25:2)

With this last verse of Numbers 25:2, the Wycliffe Bible Commentary has this to say on page 145: "They called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods. The subject THEY is feminine, referring to the daughters of Moab with whom the men of Israel committed fornication. Balak, with Balaam's advice."

We also have the testimony of Numbers 5:11-13: "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man's wife go aside, and commit a trespass against him, **AND A MAN LIE WITH HER CARNALLY**, and it be hid from the eyes of her husband, and be kept close, **AND SHE BE DEFILED...**" (KJV)

Proverbs 19:28: "An ungodly witness scorneth judgment: and the mouth of the wicked devoureth iniquity." (KJV)

Proverbs 9:17: "Stolen waters are sweet, and bread (EATEN) in secret is pleasant."

One can clearly see, the word "EAT" (#398, akal) in Hebrew, in each of the above verses means sexual intercourse, which it also means in Genesis 3:3 where Eve is confronted by Satan. The scriptural passage we are scrutinizing is: "Ye shall not EAT of it, neither shall ye TOUCH it, lest ye die. Not only does the word EAT sometimes have sexual connotations, but also the word TOUCH which is, #5060 nega, to touch; also to have sexual intercourse. Touch: Strong's Concordance #5060 Nega` (naw-gah'); a primitive root; properly, TO TOUCH, i.e. lay the hand upon (for any purpose; euphem., TO LIE WITH A WOMAN); by implication, to reach (figuratively, to arrive, acquire); violently, to strike (punish, defeat, destroy, etc.): KJV-- beat, (X be able to) bring (down), cast, come (nigh), draw near (nigh), get up, happen, JOIN, near, plague, reach (up), smite, strike, touch.

Now we will use the following Scriptures to prove and support this. In Genesis 26:10-11 we find: "And Abimelech said, What is this thou hast done unto us? **ONE OF THE PEOPLE MIGHT LIGHTLY HAVE LIEN** (lain) **WITH THY WIFE**, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us. And Abimelech charged all his people, saying, He that TOUCHETH this man or his wife shall surely be put to death." (KJV)

Genesis 20:6: "And Yahweh Almighty said unto him in a dream, Yea, I know that thou dist this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to TOUCH her."

Genesis 26:28-29: "...Let there be now an oath betwixt us, even betwixt us and thee, and let us make a covenant with thee; That thou do us no hurt, as we have not TOUCHED thee (Rebekah), and as we have done unto thee nothing but good, and have sent thee away in peace..."

Proverbs 6:29: "So he that goeth in to his neighbour's wife; whosoever TOUCHETH her shall not be innocent."

Notice the word TOUCH of Genesis 3:3 is the same #5060 as the word TOUCH, TOUCHED or TOUCHETH in these reference verses just quoted. Therefore, both the words EAT and TOUCH have sexual connotations, regardless of what the opponents of Two Seedline doctrine are touting. **WITH THESE REFERENCES, WE CAN BE SAFE IN CONCLUDING THAT EVE HAD A SEXUAL ENCOUNTER WITH THE SERPENT** (An angel, or someone of another race) **IN THE GARDEN**. Even though the opponents of the Two Seedline doctrine disagree it will not change Scriptural facts. Genesis 3:13 says: "...And the woman said, the serpent BEGUILED me, and I did EAT." **IT IS ABSURD TO SUGGEST EVE WAS BEGUILED TO EAT ORDINARY FOOD** when Yahweh had already approved of eating from garden-variety fruit trees in Genesis 1:29.

The opponents of the Two Seedline doctrine are always swift to counter with the argument, if Adam and Eve could eat of all the other trees of the garden, that would mean they could have sexual relations with anyone whom they desired.

If trees represents humans in one place, it would have to represent humans in all other places, and this would be highly immoral. This is entirely a false

assumption because sometimes the Hebrew is speaking of actual wooden trees, and at other times is speaking of idiomatic trees.

Let's use the Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies, by William Wilson (a Hebrew reference book), page 453 under the heading "TREE."

1). Strong, stout, mighty trees.

2). A tamarisk (flowering), munica, tamarix, Linn. Then perhaps any large tree, and collectively trees, a wood a grove.

3). A tree; often collective trees; green trees the righteous, dry trees the wicked, Ezekiel 20:47; 17:24, all the trees of the field, all men, the high tree, lofty and powerful, the low tree, the weak and contemptible.

4). Pl. shady trees.

For more information on "men as trees walking"; see Mark 8:24. All this demonstrates, if one wants to make a bona fide argument, one should know what one is talking about if this passage meant Adam and Eve could have sexual relations with anyone in the garden, it would have said, "all the (proverbial) beasts or trees of the field."

If one cannot separate the literal language from the idiomatic language of the Scriptures, one simply cannot understand the Bible. In such a case, it might be prudent not to have an opinion.

George M. Lamsa (an expert on Bible idioms), in his Idioms In The bible Explained," says on the following: Garden: Genesis 2:8; Metaphorically, a wife; a family. Tree of life in the midst of the garden. Genesis 2:9; Sex; posterity, progeny. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil: Genesis 2:9; Moral laws; the knowledge of good and evil. The tree of life: Genesis 2:9;

Eternal life. The tree of good and evil. Genesis 2:17; Metaphorically, sexual relationship.

We are now approaching one of the most misunderstood single passages of Scripture in the entire Bible. If we approach it too hurriedly, we will skip over it so quickly, we will never grasp its correct meaning.

There was a time when we were persuaded Genesis 3:15 was a mistranslation, but with more research, we found it to be highly accurate. We will present several different interpretations of Genesis 3:15 from several various translations:

"And I will put enmity **BETWEEN THEE** and **THE WOMAN**, and **BETWEEN THY SEED** and **HER SEED**; IT shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (KJV)

"And I **WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN THEE** and **THE WOMAN**, and **BETWEEN THY SEED** and **HER SEED**: HE shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (ASV)

"And I **WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN YOU** and **THE WOMAN**, and **BETWEEN YOUR SEED** and **HER SEED**; HE shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise him on the heel." (NAS)

"And I **WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN YOU** and **THE WOMAN**, and **BETWEEN YOUR SEED** and **HER SEED**; HE shall bruise you on the head, and you shall bruise him on the heel." (NAU)

"And I **WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN YOU** and **THE WOMAN**, and **BETWEEN YOUR OFFSPRING** and **HERS**; He will crush your head, and you will strike his heel." (NIV)

"FROM NOW ON YOU and THE WOMAN WILL BE ENEMIES, AS WILL YOUR OFFSPRING and HERS. You will strike his heel, but he will crush your head." (TLB)

"And I WILL SET A FEUD BETWEEN YOU and THE WOMAN, BETWEEN YOUR BROOD AND HERS; THEY shall strike at your head, and you shall strike at THEIR heel." (James Moffett, Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York and London)

If there were not two separate seed lines and that it was not a sexual act that Eve committed; then the following verses would have no meaning and would not have been placed in the Scriptures, for without a sexual act, the information is useless and means nothing.

"UNTO THE WOMAN HE SAID, I WILL GREATLY MULTIPLY THY SORROW AND THY CONCEPTION..." (Genesis 3:16) (KJV)

Conception: Strong's Concordance #2032 herown (hay-rone'); or herayown (hay-raw-yone'); from 2029; PREGNANCY: KJV-- conception.

Conception: Brown-Driver-Briggs' Definition #2032 herown or herayown-PHYSICAL CONCEPTION, PREGNANCY, conception. Now let's follow the proper sequence of events. Its all a matter of putting events in their proper order.

* General renovating of the earth. "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and REPLENISH the earth..." (Genesis 1:28) (KJV)

* War in the Heavens. "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels." (Revelation 12:7) (KJV)

* Satan and 1/3 of angels cast and bound to earth. "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any

more in heaven. And THE GREAT DRAGON WAS CAST OUT, THAT OLD SERPENT, CALLED THE DEVIL, AND SATAN, WHICH DECEIVETH THE WHOLE WORLD: HE WAS CAST OUT INTO THE EARTH, and HIS ANGELS WERE CAST OUT WITH HIM." (Revelation 12:7-9) (KJV)

* Adam and Eve formed in the image of Yahweh. "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground..." (Genesis 2:7) (KJV)

* Satan seduced Eve and caused a 1st PREGNANCY. "...SHE CONCEIVED, and BARE CAIN, and said, I HAVE GOTTEN A MAN FROM THE LORD (She did not say she had gotten a man from Adam, but from what she thought was a lord, as he had deceived her). And SHE AGAIN BARE HIS BROTHER ABEL (Obviously Cain and Abel were twin brothers and were born a few minutes apart as twins do. But Abel was the son of Adam, which sometimes happens when a woman has sex with two different men, she gets pregnant by them both. This has been proven to be true; although it does not happen very often, it does happen). And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground." (Genesis 4:1-2) (KJV)

* Cain murders Abel. "And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." Genesis 4:8) (KJV)

* Adam knew Eve for his second time. "And Adam knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." (Genesis 4:25) (KJV)
Seth is born as a SUBSTITUTE for Abel. (Genesis 4:25)

Once these events are placed in their proper order, all confusion with Genesis 4:1 disappears. Once we learn that Adam's knowing Eve had nothing to do with the birth of Cain, all become crystal-clear. In most cases, the logical conclusion that Cain was the son of Adam would be a proper one, but not with

this verse. The **CONCEIVING** in this verse had absolutely nothing to do with the **BEARING**. Now let's read this verse in a new light, but of an old truth: "And Adam knew Eve his wife...and (she next) bare Cain, and said, I have gotten my first (male child), a man to present to Yahweh as first born. And she again bare his (½) brother Abel.

We have changed the words a little to make the meaning eminently more evident and truth worthy. Once the true order of events of this verse is understood, it opens up a whole new understanding of what is happening in the world today.

There is very substantial evidence that the "Jews" of today are descended from Cain. We have no less than the words of Yeashua the Messiah Himself concerning this.

Once it is understood the "Jews" are devils walking around in shoe leather, we can begin to see the guiding hand of the great world conspiracy and all the monstrous problems we are faced with today. Without an understanding of the Two Seedlines, we are at a detrimental loss to know who the enemy is. The knowledge, or the lack of it, is the difference between the brightest day or the blackest night. Because this verse is not properly understood is one of the reasons that Yahweh states in Hosea: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge..." (Hosea 4:6)

One of the very first things those opposed to a literal Satan-spawned physical Seedline do, is point out the fact that the information can be found in the Jewish Talmud. We find the following on pages in a book "Eve Did She Or Didn't She? The Seedline Hypothesis Under Scrutiny" by Evangelist Ted R. Weiland, ISBN 0-9679392-0-8, Library of Congress Number: 00-090494, Published by Mission to Israel Ministries, P.O. Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363)

"So who benefits from this scriptural corruption, and where might you expect to find this Seedline doctrine taught? One Seedline teacher accurately pointed

out that this hypothesis is not of modern origin: 'The historicity of a sexual interpretation of original sin can be documented from the literature of antiquity and clearly proves beyond any doubt that this belief did not originate with modern man.' (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28)

"This is true, but from "what ancient literature" is this hypothesis extracted? This same seedliner documented several instances and in every case the material came from post-Babylonian captivity Judahites. (Now here we really must disagree with Mr. Weiland because at no time in history have the Judahites been Jews. There may have been some who converted to Judaism, but only a few and certainly never the entire tribe of Judah)

"In other words, from Judahites who had been educated in Babylonian traditions. Among others, this seedliner quoted rabbis who quoted the Talmud as "proof" for his Seedline beliefs: '...it (the Seedline hypothesis) was a common teaching among the (post-Babylonian) rabbis of antiquity...In one place, we read: 'rabbi Johanan stated. When the serpent copulated with Eve, he infused her with lust.' (Yebamoth 103b) Another rabbi states: 'Thus I have learnt, that when the serpent had intercourse with Eve he injected defilement into her.' (Haye Sarah 126a) Lastly, another replies: 'You rightly said that when the serpent had carnal intercourse with Eve he injected into her defilement.' (Haye Sarah 126b) (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28)

This seedliner also quoted several other Babylonian-influenced works of antiquity: "This (Seedline) interpretation is confirmed in the ancient literature of Israel, especially the commentaries on the Hebrew Bible written in Aramaic and commonly known as Targums. The commentaries were written after the (remnant's, people from the Tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi) return from Babylon...One text gives this interpretation of Genesis 4:1: 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived

and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like the earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord." (Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1) Another ancient commentary gives a similar interpretation of the same passage: 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain; and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord...' (Palestinian Targum to Genesis 4:1) In another rabbinic work we find a similar interpretation...And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord." (Pirke de Rabbi Elieser, 21) One Rabbinic source states: 'Even bore Cain from the filth of the serpent, and therefore from him were descended all the wicked generations, and from his side is the abode of spirits and demons.' (Ahare Moth 76b) A similar explanation for the evil deeds of Cain's lineage is found elsewhere. We read: 'For two beings had intercourse with Eve, and she conceived from both and bore two children. Each followed one of the male parents, to this side and one to the other, and similarly their characters. On the side of Cain are all the haunts of the evil species, from which come evil spirit and demons.' (Bereshith 36b) (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28-29)

Now we know that Christ said that the Jews are liars in John 8:44 but that does to mean that a liar will not sometimes tell the truth. Therefore one of the very first things those opposed to a literal Satan-spawned physical Seedline do, is point out the fact the information can be found in the Talmud. This is a really sneaky deceptive method used by many, to declare guilt by association.

The question must be asked: "Is every single word in the Talmud false?" This idea is built on the assumption, that if it is found in the Talmud, it is automatically wrong. For anyone who uses this approach, we would challenge them to prove every single word in the Talmud to be false. It simply cannot be done, even though it is a collection of the most evil and blasphemous writings ever put together. Not only is there evidence found in the Talmud substantiating the seduction of Eve, but evidence can be found in "The Lost

Books of The bible and The Forgotten books of Eden," "The Protevangelion" 10:1-10: "And when her sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade, and entering into the house, found the Virgin grown big: Then smiting upon his face, he said, With what face can I look up to the Lord my God? Or, what shall I say concerning this young woman? For I received her a Virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God! And have not preserved her such! Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her? IS NOT THE HISTORY OF ADAM EXACTLY ACCOMPLISHED IN ME? FOR IN THE VERY INSTANT OF HIS GLORY, THE SERPENT CAME AND FOUND EVE ALONE, AND SEDUCED HER. JUST AFTER THE SAME MANNER IT HAS HAPPENED TO ME. Then Joseph arising from the ground, called her, and said, O thou who hast been so much favoured by God, why hast thou done this. Why hast thou debased thy soul, who wast educated in the Holy of Holies, and received thy food from the hand of angels? But she, with a flood of tears, replied, I am innocent, and have known no man."

Some even go so far as to cite the Spirit and the Flesh as the Two Seeds. This is one of the most ridiculous, misdirected applications of holy writ to come from one pretending to be inspired. It is so nonsensical, we will not affiliate the sacred Name of Yahweh with it. If one believes the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are such, this is the way the verse should have read: "And the Lord God said to Eve's flesh, Because thou hast done this, thy flesh is cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; and thy flesh shall go upon its belly, and dust shalt thy flesh eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between the flesh of the woman and the spirit of the woman, and between the offspring of her flesh and the offspring of her spirit, and offspring of her spirit shall bruise the head of the offspring of her flesh, and the offspring of her flesh will bruise the heel of the offspring of her spirit."

Among other very important details the opponents of Two Seedline doctrine do not explain is: Why is Cain left totally out of the genealogy of Adam? Genesis, Chapter 5, gives the genealogy of Adam to Shem, Ham and Japheth, and Cain is not mentioned once! WHY?

Other genealogies in the Bible go into great detail and never leaves out a son! (Especially a firstborn son) If one reads Genesis 4:1 correctly, as depicted, it is not there either. Why is Cain totally left out?? Cain's descendants are mentioned separately in Genesis 4:17-24 and it doesn't list Adam as the father of Cain! **WHY???** The next place we find Cain in the Scriptures is Genesis 15:19 and we will have to read verses 18 through 21: "In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, And the Ammonites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." (Genesis 15:18-21) (KJV)

One of these nations among the Canaanites was the **KENITES** (#7017 Strong's) which were **DESCENDANTS OF CAIN**. Being that Cain was of the **SATANIC SEEDLINE**, he would infect his satanic blood **AMONG ALL THESE TEN NATIONS**. And the "Kenizzites" were Edomites.

In the Peake's Commentary on the bible, page 116 we find this about this mixed group of nations spoken of in Genesis 15:19-21: "When the Israelites entered Canaan they found there a **VERY MIXED** population generally designated by the term Amorite or Canaanite."

The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 38, says: "The Kenites. Here are ten nations mentioned, though afterwards reckoned but seven; see Deuteronomy 7:1; Acts 13:19. Probably some of them which existed in Abram's time had been **BLENDED** with others before the time of Moses, so that seven only out of the ten then remained."

Kenites: "[KEE nights] (metalsmiths)-- the name of a wandering tribe of people who were associated with the Midianites (Judges 1:16) and, later, with the Amalekites (1 Samuel 15:6). The Kenites lived in the desert regions of Sinai,

Midian, Edom, Amalek, and the Negev. The Bible first mentions the Kenites as one of the groups that lived in Canaan during the time of Abraham (Genesis 15:19); their territory was to be taken by the Israelites (Numbers 24:21-22). The Kenites were metal craftsmen who may have traced their ancestry to TUBAL-CAIN (a descendant of Cain) (Genesis 4:22). (from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) (Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

The next mention of the descendants of Cain is found in 1 Chronicles 2:55: "And **THE FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES** which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. **THESE ARE THE KENITES** that came of Hemath, the father of the house of RECHAB." (KJV)

The Wycliff Bible Comentary, editors: Charles F. Pfeiffer & Everett F. Harrison has this to say on page 8, and this quote will cover Genesis 3:14-15:

"**CURSED** (arûr) **ART THOU**. The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who slandered God (cf. Isaiah 65:25). **HE WAS TO REPRESENT NOT MERELY THE SERPENT RACE, BUT THE POWER OF THE EVIL KINGDOM**. As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him. **I WILL PUT ENMITY**. The word "êbâ" denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Numbers 35:19-20; Ezekiel 25:15-17; 35:5-6) **THOU SHALT BRUISE** (shûp). **A PROPHECY OF CONTINUING STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE DESCENDANTS OF WOMAN AND OF THE SERPENT TO DESTROY EACH OTHER**. The verb shûp is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Psalm 139:11). It is the same in both clauses.

"When translated 'crush' it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in also rendered lie in wait for, aim at or (LXX) watch for. The Vulgate renders it "conteret," "bruise" in the first instance and in this famous passage, **CALLED THE PROTEVAGEFIUM**,

'FIRST GOSPEL,' the announcement of a prolonged struggle, perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of the woman.

"God's promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. Thus assurance fell upon the ears of God's earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption."

The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, Volume 3, page 782:

"KENITES: Meaning (metalworkers, smiths). Clan or tribal name of semi-nomadic peoples of South Palestine and Sinai. The Aramaic and Arabic etymologies of the root 'gyn' show that it has to do with metal and metal word (thus the Hebrew word from this root, 'lance'). This probably indicates that the Kenites were metal workers, especially since Sinai and wadi 'arabah were rich in high grade copper ore. W.F. Albright has pointed to the Beni Hassan mural in Egypt (19th century B.C.)

"As an illustration of such a **WONDERING GROUP OF SMITHS**. This mural depicts thirty-six men, women and children in characteristic Semitic dress leading along with other animals, donkeys laden with **MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS**, weapons and an item which Albright has identified as a **BELLOWS**. He has further noted that Lamech's three children (Genesis 4:19-22) were responsible for **HEARDS** (Jubal), **MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS** (Jubal), and **METAL WORK** (Tubal-Cain, or Tubal, **THE SMITH**), the three occupations which seem most evident in the mural...2nd quote from the same article: **THE EARLY MONARCHY**. During this period a significant concentration of Kenites was located in the southern Judean territory. This is clear from 1 Samuel 15:6 cited above and also from David's relations with them."

Postexilic references. In 1 Chronicles 2:55 the **FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES** living at Jabaz are said to be Kenites. Apparently, during the kingdom and exile periods, certain Kenites had given up **NOMADIC SMITHING** and had

taken on a more sedentary, but equally honorable PROFESSION (?) OF SCRIBE.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 114: "The etymology of the name suggest **THAT THEY WERE SMITHS OR ARTIFICERS**, a theory which is supported by their association with the Wadi 'Arabah, where there were copper deposits which had been worked by the Egyptians since the middle of the 3rd millennium.

The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole bible has this to say on Kenite, page 293: "**THE FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES**; either civil or ecclesiastical officers of the Kenite origin, **WHO ARE HERE CLASSIFIED WITH THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, NOT AS BEING DESCENDED FROM IT**, but as dwellers within its territory, and in a measure **INCORPORATED** with its people."

The Matthew Pool's Commentary On The Holy Bible has this to say on the Kenites, Volume 1, page 778: "**THE SCRIBES**; either civil, **WHO WERE PUBLIC NOTARIES, WHO WROTE AND SIGNED LEGAL INSTRUMENTS; OR ECCLESIASTICAL...** and are here mentioned not as if they were of the tribe of Judah, but because thy dwelt among them, and probably were allied to them by marriages, and so in a manner incorporated with them. Which dwelt, or rather, dwelt; Hebrew, were dwellers. For the other translation, which dwelt, **MAY SEEM TO INSINUATE THAT THESE WERE DESCENDANTS OF JUDAH, WHICH THEY WERE NOT**; but his translation **ONLY SIGNIFIES COHABITATION WITH THEM**, for which cause they are here named with them.

All these things the Jews do today, here in America. And because Christians have listened to the lying, deceiving, traitorous, Priests of Baal, the Judeo-Christian Clergy they have almost destroyed our nation and are fast destroying our people.

Now that we have established a solid foundation in the Holy Writ concerning the Two Seedline doctrine, let's tell the story in a different way. With this narrative, the one important fact revealed in the above passages is: Yeashua our Messiah exposed the "Jews" for what they are many years ago.

You could spend thousands of dollars on books updating the story to our present time, and it is still the same old story as it was two thousand years ago, some people today have the audacity to insinuate that Our Redeemer didn't know what he was talking about. We will start this portion of our study with Genesis 3:14-15.

"And Yahweh said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy (Kenite -"Jewish") seed and her (White) seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Reread the second paragraph above. The center reference of the KJV then takes us to Revelation 12:9: "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Next we will go unaided to Matthew 3:7: "But when he (John the Baptist) saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O GENERATION (offspring) OF VIPERS, how can ye, being evil, speak good things for out of the abundance of the heart (genetic intellect) the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." From here the KJV center reference takes us to Matthew 13:38: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom (Israelites); but the tares (Jews) are the children of the wicked one."

With a reading of Colossians 2:15 we can see how Yahshua put the Satanic/Jew/Seedline to an open shame and stripped them of their authority. "And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

Now we will go to Luke 11:49-51 and use this passage rather than Matthew 23:34-36 for there are problems with Matthew's version.

"Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required (ἐκζητέω, to demand an account of) of this generation (#1074, genea); From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation (#1074, genea)."

Here Yahshua is charging the "Jews" with the murder of Abel. It would have been criminally illegal on the part of Yahshua to make such a charge if it were not true. The only way He could legally have produced such a serious charge was if the "Jews" of His day were descended from Cain, for no other person in all of history was responsible for the murder of Abel, but Cain.

Most anti-Seedliners are strangely quiet on this passage, although Ted R. Weiland in his booklet "Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?" erroneously tries to prove the scribes and Pharisees were true Israelites (on page 68) where he makes the following statement: "Seedliners claim that because the Pharisees and their progenitors were charged with the murders of all the righteous from Abel to Zacharias, they cannot be Israelites but instead must be Cainites of the seed of Satan. The truth is that because the Pharisees and their forefathers were indicted for the murder of the righteous martyrs, they cannot be Cainites but instead must be Israelites."

Weiland further states on page 94: "The Seedliners teach that the Pharisees were Cainites of the Seedline of Satan, whereas Matthew 3:7-8, 27:6-10, John 7:19, 8:28-37; Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were Judahites of Seedline of Jacob/Israel."

If what Weiland is implying were true. The Messiah would be condemning the entire race of Israelites (including Himself, His family, the Apostles, Disciples, etc.) in speaking of them as a "generation," for the word "generation," used in this passage, is #1074, and in the Greek means "race" according to "The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament," by Spiros Zodhiates, page 362: "...a race; then generally in the sense of affinity of communion based upon the sameness of stock. Race or posterity...A descent or genealogical line of ancestors or descendants..."

"The Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament," by Joseph Henry Thayer agrees, page 112: "...a begetting, birth, nativity...passively, that which has been begotten, men of the same stock, a family...the several ranks in a natural descent, the successive members of a genealogy...metaphor, a race of men very like each other in endowments, pursuits, character; and especially in a bad sense a perverse race..."

It would appear that maybe Weiland should have checked his Greek before he made such a spurious statement. Therefore, the only conceivable meaning this passage could convey is: the "Pharisees" were the genea of Cain. Yahshua clearly told the "Jewish" Pharisees, John 10:26, "...YE ARE NOT MY SHEEP..." there is nothing more blasphemous than to imply that Yahshua the Messiah was a racial brother to the "Jews."

Evidently, the single Seedliners never read "Josephus, Wars," 2:8:2. Josephus makes it quite clear the Pharisees and Sadducees WERE NOT ISRAELITES BY BIRTH. Let's now read this passage: "For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to severer discipline, are called Essens. THESE LAST ARE JEWS (Judah) BY

BIRTH, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have.”

It would appear from this that of the three mentioned, only the Essenes could claim to be pure blooded Israelites; that many, perhaps a majority of the Pharisees and Sadducees were neither true Israelites nor of the true Tribe of Judah.

Why didn't Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Jews by birth? We know that in John 8:33 & 37, it appears from the rendering, that the scribes and Pharisees might be true Israelites. Sure, the Arabs can claim Abraham as their father.

We know, also, that the “Jews” of Messiah's day had absorbed Edomite blood, and therefore could claim both Abraham and Isaac as their fathers. The Shelanite/Judahites could even claim an affinity with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah, but that doesn't make them of the true Tribe of Judah. Recent archaeological finds are showing evidence two of Esau's wives were, more than likely, of the Cain-Satanic-Seedline. Even Howard B. Rand in his book “Primo-Genesis,” plate 11, at the ends of his book, shows Pharaohs Ramesses I & II of Egypt being descended from the House of Esau through Eliphaz.

As was indicated previous, there are problems with Matthew 23:34-35, a parallel of Luke 11:49-51, quoted above. In these passages, we are being told that (1) The Almighty would send apostles and prophets (future tense), (2) That there had been scribes and prophets sent in THE PAST, (3) These past scribes and prophets were all the way from, and including, Abel, to Zacharias, and (4) That this race of Cain was in times past, and throughout the future, responsible for their deaths. If you will read these passages very carefully, you will notice Abel was the first righteous prophet. The next thing which should be noticed is the fact that Luke does not mention Zacharias' father. From research, it would seem to appear that someone added the words “son

of Barachias' in Matthew 23:35. If this is the case, it has caused a lot of confusion. Quoting from "A Commentary on The Holy Bible," edited by Rev. J.R. Dummelow M.A., page 701: "Zacharias son of Barachias; Jesus probably said 'Zachariah,' as in St. Luke, without mentioning the father's name, but the evangelist or one of the earliest copyists, who thought it necessary to distinguish among the twenty-nine Zachariah of the Old Testament, and understood the canonical prophet to be meant, added the word 'son of Barachias.' There can be no real doubt that the person meant is Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (see 2 Chronicles 24:20), concerning whom there was a Jewish tradition, that his blood could not be removed by washing, but remained bubbling on the ground where it had been shed. In the Jewish arrangement of the books of the sacred Canon, Chronicles stands last, so that Jesus chose His examples from the first and last books of the Jewish (it should be Hebrew, not "Jewish" Bible) Bible."

The story told here can be found in many reference books. The account might even have a thread of truth. The problem here is: it doesn't square with the rest of Scripture. While the story about the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20 is undoubtedly true, it is probably **THE WRONG ZECHARIAH**. No doubt, some copyist did insert "son of Barachias," for it is not found in Luke. The problem is: **MOST OF THE RECORDED PROPHETS** were after 878 B.C., when this particular Zechariah lived.

In other words, if Yahshua was talking about the prophets between Abel and the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20, it would exclude most of the major and minor prophets. If you will check the dates in which most of the major and minor prophets lived, you will see what we mean. We are sure the Cain-Satanic-Seedline killed most of Yahweh's prophets after 878 B.C. It's like saying that the WAR started with the killing of Abel and continued to the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:20; then subsided until the time of Yahshua, and then resumed. The **WAR** has been continuous ever since it started in Genesis 3:15.

Another Zechariah to be cited is the Zechariah mentioned by several commentaries and reference books, who lived about 40 years after the Messiah. This one can be found in Josephus' Wars 4:5:4. The only one left that really makes any sense is the death of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, found in "The Protevangelion" of "The Lost Books Of The Bible And The Forgotten Books Of Eden," 16:9-21, page 36: "But Herod made search after John, and sent servants to Zacharias, when he was (ministering) at the altar, and said unto him, Where hast thou hid thy son? He replied to them, I am a minister of God (Yahweh), and a servant at the altar; how should I know where my son is/ So the servants went back, and told Herod the whole; at which he was incensed, and said, Is not this the son of his like to be king in Israel? He sent therefore again his servants to Zacharias, saying, Tell us the truth, where is thy son, for you know that your life is in my hand. So the servants went and told him all this: But Zacharias replied to them, I am a martyr for God (Yahweh), and if he shed my blood, the Lord (Yahweh) will receive my soul. Besides know that ye shed innocent blood. However Zacharias was murdered in the entrance of the temple and altar, and about the partition; But the children of Israel knew not when he was killed. Then at the hour of salutation the priests went into the temple, but Zacharias did not according to custom meet them and bless them; Yet they still continued waiting for him to salute them; And when they found he did not in a long time come, one of them ventured into the holy place where the altar was, and he saw blood lying upon the ground congealed; when, behold , a voice from heaven said, Zacharias is murdered and his blood shall not be wiped away until THE REVENGE OF HIS BLOOD COME..."

You can clearly see here the description of Zacharias' death at the hand of Herod fits Luke 11:47-51 and Matthew 23:34-36 quite well. More importantly, it doesn't leave any huge gaps in history from Abel to this Zacharias. Also, with the future tense, it covers the entire time period from Yahshua up until our present time. There have been no time outs in this WAR. For evidence that it is a genetic race war between the children of darkness and the children of light, we will quote the "Believer's Bible Commentary," by William

MacDonald on Matthew 23:36, page 1291; also from page 1416 concerning Luke 11:50-51. While MacDonald doesn't grasp the "Jew" question, he understands it is a matter of "race."

"The guilt of all the past would come on the generation or **RACE** to which Christ (Yahshua) was speaking, as if all previous shedding of innocent blood somehow combined and climaxed in the death of the sinless Savior. A torrent of punishment would be poured out on the nation that hated its Messiah without a cause and nailed Him to a criminal's cross. He would require of that generation the blood of all God's (Yahweh's) spokesmen, beginning with the first recorded case in the Old Testament, that of Abel, down to the last instance, that of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the temple...Therefore the Lord Jesus (Yahshua) ran the entire gamut of martyrs when He mentioned Abel and Zechariah. As He uttered these words, He well know that the generation then living would put Him to death on the cross, and thus bring to an awful climax all their previous persecution of men of God (Yahweh)."

It was not at the cross that Messiah imposed revenge for all the prophets from Abel up until His time, but at the siege of Titus at Jerusalem in 70 A.D. For insight on this, we will quote from the "Adam Clarke's Commentary On The Bible," abridged by Ralph Earle, pages 816 and 874. Again, these are comments on the passages; Luke 11:47-51 and Matthew 23:34-36: "The Lord (Yahshua) would, after the crucifixion of Christ (Yahshua), visit upon them the murder of all those righteous men, that their state should grow worse and worse, till at the last the Temple should be destroyed, and they (were) finally ruined by the Romans. Required. May be translated either by the word 'visited' or 'revenged,' and the latter word evidently conveys the meaning of our Lord (Yahshua). They are here represented **AS HAVING THE BLOOD AMONG THEM**; and it is intimated that God (Yahweh) will come by and by to require it, and to inquire how it was shed, and **TO PUNISH THOSE WHO SHED IT.**"

If you don't understand Two Seedline, you can't grasp the meaning of all that was going on at that particular time. Now a comment from "The Wycliffe Bible Commentary," concerning Matthew 23:34 on page 971:

"These persecutions here foretold would fill up the measure of the Jew's guilt, so that divine destruction would come upon that generation (descendants of Cain) of the nation."

The "Matthew Henry's Commentary," on Luke 11:49-51 found in volume 5, page 704: "That they must expect no other than to be reckoned with, as the fillers up of the measure of persecution, v. 50, 51. They keep up the trade as it were in succession, and therefore are responsible for the debts of the company, even those it has been contracting all along from the blood of Abel, when the world began, to that of Zacharias, and so forward to the end of the Jewish state; it shall all be required of this generation (race), this last generation of the Jews, whose sin in persecuting Christ's apostles would exceed any of the sins of that kind that their fathers were guilty of, and so would bring wrath upon them to the uttermost, 1 Thessalonians 2:15-16. Their destruction by the Romans was so terrible that it might well be reckoned the completing of God's (Yahweh's) vengeance upon that persecuting nations...They are reprov'd for opposing the gospel of Christ (Yahshua), and doing all they could to obstruct the progress and success of it, v. 52...They had not, according to the duty of their place, faithfully expounded to the people those scriptures of the Old Testament which pointed at the Messiah, which if they had been led into the right understanding by the lawyers, they would readily have embraced him and his doctrine: but instead of that, they had perverted those texts, and had cast a mist before the eyes of the people, by their corrupt glosses upon them, and this is called taking away the key of knowledge; instead of using that key for the people, and helping them to use it aright, they hid it from them; this is called, in Matthew, shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men." (Matthew 23:13)

From "Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible," we get this on Luke 11:51, volume 3, page 232: "The Pharisees, like a company of wretched

hypocrites, under a pretense of their honoring the memories of the prophets under the Old Testament, took great care to repair and to adorn their sepulchers, while in the mean time their hearts were as full of malice against the truth, and against Christ (Yahshua), and those who came to reveal God's (Yahweh's) will to them, as ever were their fathers against the prophets; and, saith our Savior, I who am the Wisdom of God, tell you, that I shall send you apostles and prophets, and some of them you shall kill, others you shall persecute; that all the righteous blood that hath been shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, may come on you..."

You will notice there is some question as to who the correct Zacharias of Luke 11:51 and Matthew 23:35 is, but there is absolutely no question from these references just quoted as to who was Abel's killer. As you can clearly see, the anti-Seedliners have a problem with Luke 11:47-51 and Matthew 23:34-36, and they refuse to address it.

As The Serpent Beguiled Eve

The next passage we are going to consider is 2 Corinthians 11:2-3: "...for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Yahshua. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Yahshua."

The anti-Seedliners really like to jump on this one and proclaim it's all a matter of mental seduction. It would appear that before Eve was seduced by Satan, she was a "chaste virgin" according to this passage. Was Eve then a chaste virgin physically?, or a chaste virgin mentally? It should be obvious that Paul is telling the Corinthians that he desired their minds not to be violated as Eve was physically violated. Why even use the term "chaste virgin" if Eve was not violated physically? Notice that Paul tells these Corinthians he had espoused them to one husband. He is saying that he would rather not have them to become espoused to an additional husband as Eve was. In other words, "I

have espoused you to one husband"...not as "Eve." Paul was simply implying that Eve, after her encounter with Satan, was no longer a chaste virgin.

The Greek Proves Eve Was Beguiled Mentally & Physically

The anti-Seedliners simply haven't done their homework on the Greek in this passage. If it were speaking of being mentally "beguiled" by words, it would have used the word #538, *apatao*, meaning to deceive, bring, seduce or mislead into error. Or, if Paul would have meant mental seduction, he probably would have used #5422 or #5423 as in Galatians 6:3 & Titus 1:10. Instead of the word #1818, *exapatao*, is used. W.E. Vine in his "An Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Word," page 112, explains it like this: "Exapatao is a **STRENGTHENED** form of *apatao*...is rendered 'beguile,' 2 Corinthians 11:3; the more adequate rendering would be 'as the serpent thoroughly beguiled Eve.' So in 1 Timothy 2:14, in the best miss., this **STRONGER** form is used of Satan's deception of Eve, literally thoroughly beguiled; the **SIMPLER** verb *apatao*, is used of Adam."

If a mental seduction were meant, the word #538 *apatao*, would have been used. W.E. Vine repeats his explanation of the use of the Greek words **APATAO** and **EXAPATAO** on pages 278 & 279 under the word "deceive." Under the heading "verbs," on the word *apatao* he says this: "...of those who deceive 'with empty words,' belittling the true character of the sins mentioned, Ephesians 5:6...of the fact that Adam was 'not beguiled,' 1 Timothy 2:14, R.V. (Cp. What is said of Eve; se *exapatao* below..."

Then Vine continues: "**EXAPATAO...INTENSIVE...signifies to BEGUILLE THOROUGHLY, to DECEIVE WHOLLY...**"

Thayer in his "Greek Lexicon" and Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his "Word Study Dictionary N.T." agree with W.E. Vine.

Anti-Seedliner Addresses 2 Corinthians 11:3

Most anti-Seedliners avoid this passage with a twenty-foot pole, but, in his booklet “Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?,” Ted R. Weiland takes a blind stab in the dark at 2 Corinthians 11:3. First, we would mention that Weiland does not point out the difference between APATAO and EXAPATAO as has been explained by W.E. Vine above. Without such an explanation, one can see how Weiland might drift into a dangerous state of error. As we quote Weiland now on pages 38-29, you can perceive his careless, or maybe blatant omission: “Just as they misconstrue the Hebrew rod, the Seedliners distort the meaning of the Greek word ‘exapatao,’ translated ‘beguiled,’ to mean ‘sexual seduction’ in 2 Corinthians 11:3. ‘Exapatao’ is found six times in the New Testament; it is translated ‘beguiled’ once and ‘deceived’ five times. As was the case with its Hebrew counterpart ‘nasha,’ the Greek word ‘exapataho’ (sic) is not once used with sexual connotations.

“If ‘exapatao’ means to sexually seduce, as Seedline teachers claim, then in Romans 7:11 the Apostle Paul declared that sin sexually seduced him. In Romans 16:17-18 Paul warned the Roman church lest divisive false teachers sexually seduced them, as in 1 Corinthians 3:18 Paul warned the Corinthian Christians not to sexually seduce themselves. Consequently, there is nothing in the Biblical use of either ‘nasha’ or ‘exapatao’ to corroborate, justify or validate the Seedlines’ interpretation of these two words.

“If the serpent corresponds to Satan, and the beguiling in Genesis 3 and 2 Corinthians 11 was sexual in nature, then the Apostle Paul was warning the Corinthian Christians against Satan’s intention to fornicate with them. If such were the case, then why did not the other New Testament writers or Yahshua warn of the possibility? Why? Because fornication was not the sin in Genesis 3, and it was not the sin Paul warned the Corinthian Church about.”

Again, if Paul would have meant mental seduction, he probably would have used #5422 or #5423 as in Galatians 6:3 and Titus 1:10. Some of the single

Seedliners do not seem to understand the Bible, both TO and NT, uses vulgarities.

The prophets called both Israel and Judah “harlots” and “whores.” the prophets really used some very graphic language at times, and Paul was no different. We would rather not have to explain to a fully grown man about the birds and the bees. Yes, Paul did compare being “deceived” to non-marital sexual intercourse. We do the same thing today. In order to explain, we will illustrate with some modern-day vulgarities similar to the prophets of old. When a man today gets cheated in a business deal, he might say something like this: “That bastard screwed me out of 100 dollars” or “I really got shafted on that one.” We think you get the point, and we would rather not elaborate any further.

Yes, Paul was telling the Romans in 7:11 that his own sin (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could destroy him. Yes, Paul was telling the Romans in 16:17-18 that false teachers (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could corrupt them.

Yes, Paul was telling the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 3:18 that their own self-conceited wisdom (comparable to non-marital sexual intercourse) could mislead them. And, Yes, Paul was telling the Corinthian Christians in 2 Corinthians 11:3 that they could be mentally “beguiled” as Eve was literally mentally and physically sexually “beguiled.” Our own advice is: **BE CAREFUL OF PEOPLE WHO USE WORD TRICKERY.** The object is to set you up on one word, and then clout you with five or six reverse meaning examples.

The “Jews” are masters at this sort of thing. Carefully go back over the quotation by Weiland and see if he might have been setting us up. You might start with “If exapatao means...”

If you have his book, you might check to see if he may have used that same system in other places. **WATCH FOR THE SETUP FOLLOWED BY**

SEVERAL SEEMINGLY ABSURD EXAMPLES. The con-artist might approach you something like this: “If this means this, look how absurd this, and this, and this, and this, and this is.” One you become aware of this devious system, you can no longer be deceived into believing darkness is light and bitter is sweet.

“The Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible,” abridged by Ralph Earle, has this to say about this passage, 2 Corinthians 11:2-3, on page 1147: “That I may present you as a chaste virgin. There seems to be a reference to Leviticus 21:14, that the high priest must not marry anyone that was not a pure virgin. Here then Christ (Yahshua) is the High Priest, the Souse or Husband; the Corinthian Church, the pure virgin to be espoused; the apostle and his helpers had educated and prepared this virgin for her husband and espoused her to him...As the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety. This is a strong reflection on the false apostle and his teaching. He was subtle, and by his subtlety he was enabled to corrupt the minds of the people from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ (Yahshua); or, to follow the metaphor, he had seduced the pure, chaste, well-educated virgin from her duty, affection, and allegiance to her one and only true Husband, the High Priest, Jesus Christ (Yahsuah).” As we can clearly see from the events as they occur, we are moving very rapidly toward the climax of a 7,000 plus year-old **WAR**. The forces from both sides of this war are gathering for a final battle which will culminate in the total extermination of one side or the other.

This war will not end with a truce or an armistice, but will be a fight to the death. As a matter of fact, we are already in this last great battle, and, for the moment, we are rapidly going down to defeat.

And, unless our people wake up PDQ, we are in for one “H” of a conflict. All one has to do is observe the multiculturalism and miscegenation that is going on, and you can very quickly calculate where we stand in this life and death struggle. While all this is going on, the masses have been lulled into a state of indifference and unconcern, while the Judeo-Christian Clergy are actually

aiding and abetting the enemy. And, if this were not bad enough, the anti-Seedliners blow the ‘trumpet’ with an “uncertain sound,” 1 Corinthians 14:8: “For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?”

By denying the two Seedline message of Genesis 3:15, this is exactly what they are doing. Actually, it’s a capital crime in a time of danger not to identify the enemy. Today, Israel is in greater peril than at any time in her history. (Mark 13:22)

An Uncertain Sound

We will shortly see an excellent example of a “trumpet” with an “uncertain sound.” Once we understand we are in a WAR where the “Jews” are implementing their plan to interbreed the White Israelite peoples out of existence, any rhetorical proclamation which would aid such a cause would be very traitorous and untimely. Jeffery A. Weakley, a fervently, caustic, anti-seedliner, in his “The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History,” says this on page 30-31L: “Results of the Satanic Seedline Teaching. The results of the Satanic Seedline teaching (if accepted as true) should speak for themselves. Most Seedliners hate Jews today (those who claim to be) because of their ethnic origin. For this same reason, they honor the white races because of their ethnic origin. This easily leads to race worship. They stress the physical aspect of God’s Word (that is the physical descent of Israel), which is ignored by most churches today, so much that they forget or neglect the spiritual aspect, which is of more importance (Galatians 3:26-29). They make true the words in 1 Samuel 16:7 ‘...for the Lord seeth not as a man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.’

“Many Seedliners go so far as to say that only whites (Israelites) can have eternal life with Christ. Now it is clear that only Israelites can be ‘redeemed’ (Galatians 4:5), but this is not to say that other races can’t be born again. Our eternal life is the result of our election by God to accept is Son by faith. If the Scriptures are to be accepted, **WE MUST CONCLUDE** that people **OF ALL**

RACES can be born again. 'Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of the truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.' ...The Seedliners that worship their race are no different than those who purport to be Jews. Jews today take pride in their race (Here we can see this fellow continue with the lie that the Jews are a race, when they are not they are a people who share the same religion, called Judaism) and consider themselves better than everyone else. Even the Jewish religion (Judaism) teaches that Jews are superior by race. This ludicrous belief was taught at the Baptist Bible College I attended. There is no doubt that God chose Israel to be His people, but nowhere do I find that it was because Israel was a superior race. So whether it be Seedliners or Jews, the idea of a superior race is inconsistent with the teachings of God's Word."

As you can clearly see, Jeffrey A. Weakley is in no position to fight back at the enemy in this great racial war to destroy the Israel Race. With his attitude on race, it wouldn't be surprising if his daughter or granddaughter ended up getting pregnant by a Negro or Mongolian. But, that would probably be all right with him as long as they are "born again."

He indicates, according to his knowledge, that the Bible doesn't teach such a thing. Mr. Jeffery A. Weakley should be reminded that the Almighty killed two of Judah's sons by his Canaanite wife in order to prevent the Satanic gene-pool from getting into the Royal Messianic Line. You will notice, Weakley used Galatians 3:26-29 to try to make his point. Let's take a look at that passage and see what it is really talking about. Weakley intimates that in this passage it is speaking of other races getting into the kingdom.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

With this passage, Weakley attempts to bring all the other races under Yahweh's Covenant to Abraham. This is the same approach that Judeo-Christianity uses. Another Judeo-Christianity person, trying to make the same point as Weakley, also quoted to us, Colossians 3:11 where it says: "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all."

This other person also quoted Romans 2:10-11; 10:11-13 and 11:13 in order to bring other races under the Covenant. In answering this we said: "You quoted Romans 10:11-13; Galatians 3:27-29; Colossians 3:11; Romans 2-10:11; 11:13. We don't want to appear as a smart aleck or a know-it-all, but we would like to present some background on these passages which we can authenticate from a combination of Scripture, secular history and archaeology. "As you quoted three passages from Romans, let's consider who the Romans were. If you will look up in your encyclopedia (and you may have to use more than one) for the founding of Rome, you will find it was established under the insignia of a she-wolf (the story of Romulus and Remus). Who then, in the Bible is identified as the wolf?

The answer is found in Genesis 49:27; Benjamin is the wolf. The Romans were Benjamites. The Romans to whom Paul preached were Israelites of the Tribe of Benjamin. Do you know anyone by the name of Wolf/Wolfe?, no doubt a Benjamite.

"Also the name "Wilson" means "wolf's son." As Zerah-Judah also settled in that area, some of the Romans may have been of the House of Zerah/Judah. When it says, Romans 10:12, 'For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek...' it is indicating there is no difference between the Tribe of Dan and the Tribe of Judah for they are both Israelites. The term "Jew" must be qualified as there were true Israelites of the Tribe of Judah and some counterfeit people claiming themselves the Tribe of Judah, but lying about it. (Revelation 2:9; 3:9)

“As the word ‘Greek’ is used three times in these passages, let’s investigate who the Greeks were. Some of the Tribe of Dan left Egypt before the Exodus. As Hebrew writing has no vowels, it is written simply as ‘dn.’ Variations of the name can be Dan, Den, Din, Don or Dun. Do you know anyone by the names of dunn, Dunbar, Duncan, Dunham or Dunlap? Genesis 49:17 says: ‘Dan shall be a serpent by the way...’ Judges 5:17 indicates that Dan literally lived in his ships. Dan, in his ships, wove like a serpent up every river alley putting up a sign with his name on it.

The river DANube is named after him. The name McDONald means ‘son of Don, or Dan.’ Paul preached at a place called ‘MaceDONia’ in Greece. (Acts 16:9-12) We know you know the story. When Paul was preaching there to Danites, he was preaching to Israelites.

“We are glad you quoted Colossians 3:11. What this verse is saying in essence is: There is no “difference” between a genuine member of the Israelite Tribe of Judah and the Israelite-Greek Tribe of Dan; there is no “difference” between a circumcised Israelite and an uncircumcised Israelite; there is no “difference” between a Barbarian Israelite and a Scythian Israelite; there is no “difference” between a bond Israelite or a free Israelite, for Christ (Yahshua) is genetically a brother, or related to all of them. Galatians 3:28-29 goes on to indicate there is no genetic “difference” between an Israelite male or an Israelite female, for if you are a genetic relative to Christ (Yahshua), you are Abraham’s sperma and you are included under Yahweh’s Covenant to Abraham.

“There is one other group we should talk about, and that is Zerah/Judah. There is much evidence, that some of Zerah/Judah, like Dan, left Egypt before the Exodus. If you will check 1 Chronicles 2:6, you will find that Zarah had a son by the name of Dara. In 1 Kings 4:31 his name is spelled Darda. This branch of Zerah/Judah left Egypt, as we say, BEFORE the Exodus. Today the area they settled in is named the DARDAnelles, although they are long gone

from there. They were Trojans and established the city of Troy where they lived for four hundred years. The Israelite/Trojans then moved to Italy, and while some stayed in Italy, others returned to the Aegean area, built hundreds of ships and sailed to Britain. This part of Zerah/Judah's history is completely documented by Bible and secular history, there are no missing links. In other words, it is an absolute historical fact that Zerah/Judah made it to Britain. The Scottish Highlanders wore kilts like the Trojans. In his 1999 book "The Bible Is History," by Ian Wilson, page 87, it has been found that the Israelites of Canaan wore kilts also; it has been a mode of Israelite dress from the beginning.

"As for the 'Barbarians' and 'Scythians:' In Jeremiah 51:20, Yahweh told Israel: 'Thou art my battle axe and weapons of war: for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms.' Judah was the fighting tribe. The Barbarians of Paul's time were the German tribes, and are rightly described as such in Jeremiah. Our ancestors were these same Barbarians, for we are German and of the Tribe of Judah. The name Scythian is one of the names which the Israelites were called after breaking away from the Assyrians. Therefore, the Scythians spoken of in Colossians 3:11 are definitely Israelites. As a matter of fact, all the Scripture references you quoted were speaking only of Israelites."

Weakley accuses us Two Seedliners of taking Scripture out of context, but who really is, for he proved **ABSOLUTELY NOTHING** to backup his thesis by referring to Galatians 3:26-29? Jeffrey A. Weakley then proceeds on pages 14 to 20 to try to prove that Two Seedline doctrine (according to his assumption) must be false. In doing this, he presents some history of the Identity Movement which we believe you will find interesting; although his conclusions, as in his foregoing postulation, are flawed: "The Origin of the False Teaching: If, as I contend, the Satanic Seedline doctrine (as taught by the Seedliners) is not found in the Scriptures, and since it was not taught by any of the early church fathers as being correct, how did it find its way into the Christian belief system known as 'Identity?' To find the answer we need to properly define Identity. There are at least three specific systems of belief which are very

similar, and yet each is distinctly different. There are the Anglo-Israel, British-Israel, and Christian-Israel beliefs. Identity can include all three of these beliefs, depending on how they are taught. For a definition of Identity we will go to the man who first made the term popular in America over 50 years ago (see *The National Christian*, 1991 Ed., p. 25).

“That man is Howard B. Rand. ‘The preaching of the Identity has been going on for years now. It has resulted in millions in Anglo-Saxondom becoming acquainted with the fact that they are lineal descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel (This writer, like all those who try to condemn the Christian Identity beliefs, never mentions that Judah, Benjamin, and Levi were also carried into Assyrian captivity with the other ten tribes, but a hundred or so years later)...Thus, the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Scandinavian, Celtic, Nordic, and Slavic people stand out as Israel in these latter days.’ (Study in Revelation, by Howard B. Rand, p. 115)

“Thus Identity is the belief or teaching that the Anglo-Saxon and kindred peoples are the physical descendants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament. (He is wrong here, we believe that all 13 tribes are Israelites) I will note here that many believe that Wesley Swift founded Identity (see *Bitter Harvest*, by James Corcoran, p. 38) in 1946 and others that the ‘Identity movement was conceived and first spread by three men with ties to the Radical Right. Wesley Swift, Bertrand Comporet, and William Gale.’ (See *God, Guts, and Guns*, by Philip Finch, p. 68) Although this view is set forth, it is simply the product of those who do too little research and do not yet have all the facts. The simple fact is that the term ‘Identity’ as used to describe the Anglo-Saxon history was used as far back as 1884, when Elieser Bassin used it. He tells how he picked it up from others before him. However, it was Howard B. Rand that called the Anglo-Israel history ‘Identity.’ Rand did not hold or teach the Satanic Seedline doctrine. ‘Two sons were born to Adam and Eve and they were named in their order: Cain and Abel,’ (Primo-Genesis, by Howard B. Rand, p. 41) The Satanic Seedline was brought into the Identity teaching with San Jacinto Capt an Wesley A. Swift. Actually, San Jacinto Capt

claimed to have gotten Wesley Swift started (in Identity) (see Committee of the States, by Cheri Seymour, p. 83)

In any case, Wesley Swift presented the Seedline doctrine to Gerald L. K. Smith (see Besieged Patriot, by Gerald L.K. Smith, pp. 238-239) and shortly later Jacinto Capt (father of E. Raymond Capt, who has written many outstanding books on archaeology) introduced William P. Gale to Swift. In later years Richard Butler would take over Swift's Church (now known as Aryan Nations).

"As this is not meant to be a history of the identity movement, I will stop here, but suffice it to say that the Seedline doctrine saturated Identity through the influence of San Jacinto Capt, Wesley Swift, and William P. Gale. Where did they get this belief? Capt and Swift both got it from the Ku Klux Klan (they both were members; see Committee of the States, by Cheri Seymour, p. 84)."

We need to interrupt Weakley at this point, for he is making a dangerous and uncalled for false assumption. From this point on, for the rest of chapter 4, he builds a case based on circumstantial supposition. (1) He first makes the claim, just quoted, that San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift got the Satanic Seedline doctrine from the Ku Klux Klan; (2) He next presents evidence the Ku Klux Klan was instituted by the Mason; (3) Then, he makes a connection of the Masons with the Gnostics; and (4) Lastly, he connects the Gnostic with the Jews and the Talmud, and makes the claim the Satanic Seedline doctrine originated with the "Jews."

Jeffrey A. Weakley has a weak link in his hypothesis. He did not prove with any tangible evidence that there was a connection of the Satanic Seedline doctrine with the Ku Klux Klan! If he had had any evidence, you can be quite sure he would have quoted it. There isn't any, and he didn't. It is like saying he saw a person check in at a motel one night at Salem, Massachusetts, and then, swearing to God on a stack of Bibles 20 feet high, proclaiming he knew

for a fact that person practiced witchcraft. We would sure hate to be on trial for our life and have Weakley as a juror.

Let's now continue with Weakley's remarks on the KKK on pages 15-16:

"The Klan takes some explaining. The first Ku Klux Klan was organized in Tennessee in 1867 under the leadership of Gen. N.B. Forrest. This Klan was disbanded sometime in 1869 (see "Vigilantes of Christendom, by Richard K. Hoskins, pp. 245, 247). The next official Ku Klux Klan was founded in 1915 as The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. The founder was William Joseph Simmons, who was a Royal Arch Mason (see Occult Theocracy, by Lady Queensborough, aka Edith "Starr Miller, p. 607) thus the Ku Klux Klan got its Seedline doctrine from the Masonic teaching. Many people do not know that a Mason started the Ku Klux Klan, and fewer people know the Masons teach the Seedline doctrine.

"William P. Gale became an honorary member of the Kyu Klux Klan after he had already been teaching the Seedline doctrine for some time. He denied that he developed his belief from the Ku Klux Klan, and this may be true. William P. Gale was a long-time Mason and developed his Seedline belief from the same place the Ku Klux Klan got theirs: the Mason. Now I will prove that the Masons teach Seedline." (Here let me state unequivocally that the Masons do not teach the Seedline doctrine, in fact they deny it. I was a Mason, Blue Lodge, Scottish Rite, and Shriner, and nowhere and at no time did they teach this Seedline doctrine)

Mr. Weakley, we may have another problem. We don't know whether it is true or not, but we have heard that Howard B. Rand was also a Mason. If this is true, why did he teach against the Two Seedline doctrine? If this is correct, would this discredit all of Mr. Rand's teachings also; or any other former Mason for that part? This is the old DISHONEST con-artist's trice of GUILT BY ASSOCIATION, plan and simple.

Weakley Plays His Ace Card

On page 20, Jeffrey A. Weakly finally plays his ace card, and thinks he has won his argument. After going step by step from the KKK to the Talmud, he lays all his cards on the table. This is what he says: “Next we find that the Kabbalists go their teaching from the Jewish Babylonian Talmud. ‘...what evil, however, could be involved here? (8) That of infusing her with sensual lust. For R. Johanan stated: When the serpent copulated with Eve, (9) he infused her (10) with lust...’ (9) In the Garden of Eden, according to a tradition. (10) I.e., the human species...” (The Babylonian Talmud, Soncino Press Ed., Seder Nashim (Yebamoth 203b))

“The Babylonian Talmud is the written form of the ‘tradition of the elders’ (Matthew 15:2-3) which had been orally taught since the Babylonian captivity. This teaching was a perversion of God’s Law. These traditions were actually a combination of Baal worship (as practiced in Babylon) and the Law of God as given to Israel by Moses ...Thus we have arrived at the human origin of the Satanic Seedline doctrine: Babylon. What I find especially fascinating is that most Seedliners express unfathomable hostility toward those who call themselves Jews today and at the same time they adopt the ‘Jewish fables’ (Titus 1:14) that came out of Babylon.”

To catch you off your guard, Weakley wants you to presume that every last statement in the Babylonian Talmud is a 100% total lie. If this were true, even the “Jews” would repudiate their own Talmudic books. Weakley believes he has pulled some type of magic string by quoting directly from the Babylonian Talmud, and you will automatically, like a programmed robot, buy his argument. It’s similar to the way the “Jews” use the magic word “anti-Semite.” Again, it’s the old dishonest “Jewish” con-artist’s trick of guilt by association, plan and simple, and Weakley is playing it to the hilt of his sword. Our advice is: Don’t ever stay at a motel overnight in Salem, Massachusetts, or you might be accused of being a witch.

Another Witness

One of the very first things the anti-Seedliners who are opposed to a literal Satan-spawned genetic physical Seedline do, is point to the fact the information can be found in the Babylonian Talmud. Jeffrey A. Weakley, and many others of his particular beliefs, is no exception as quoted above. This is a sneaky, deceptive, and dishonest method used by “many” (not all by any stretch of imagination, but by many) to declare guilt by association. The question must be asked: Is every single word in the Talmud false? This idea is built on the assumption, that if it is found in the Babylonian Talmud, it is automatically evil. For anyone who uses this approach, we would challenge them to prove every single word in the Babylonian Talmud to be false. It can't be done, because not everything that is said in there is false, even though it is a collection of the most evil writings ever put together. Only someone who does not know anything about the Talmud would believe or accept such a totally flimsy premise. Not only is there evidence found in the Talmud substantiating the seduction of Eve, but evidence can be found in “The Lost Books of the Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden.”

The “Protevangelion” 10:1-10: “And when her sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade, and entering into the house, found the Virgin grown big: Then smiting upon his face, he said, With what face can I look up to the Lord my God? Or, what shall I say concerning this young woman? For I received her a Virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God and have not preserved her such. Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her? **IS NOT THE HISTORY OF ADAM EXACTLY ACCOMPLISHED IN ME? FOR IN THE VERY INSTANT OF HIS GLORY, THE SERPENT CAME AND FOUND EVE ALONE, AND SEDUCED HER. JUST AFTER THE SAME MANNER IT HAS HAPPENED TO ME** Then Joseph arising from the ground, called her, and said, O thou who hast been so much favored by God, why hast thou done this? Why hast thou thus debased thy soul, who wast educated in the Holy of Holies (she was able to stay and live there until she started to have her period, and after that the

priests married her off), and received thy food from the hand of angels? But she, with a flood of tears, replied, I am innocent, and have known no man.” If you will remember, Jeffrey A. Weakley made this statement on page 14: “The Origin of the False Teaching. If, as we contend, the Satanic Seedline doctrine (as taught by the Seedliners) is not found in the Scriptures, **AND SINCE IT WAS NOT TAUGHT BY ANY OF THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS** as being correct, how did it find its way into the Christian belief system known as ‘Identity?’”

As he seemed to have such a high regard of his own ability to research, and was so critical of the Two Seedliners to do so, let’s see whether or not the “early church fathers” understood anything concerning this doctrine. For this we will use part of an article from “The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible,” volume E-J, pages 799-800: “James, Protevangelium Of...The earliest of the infancy gospels, recounting the birth, childhood, adolescence, token marriage, supernatural pregnancy, and delivery of Mary. Together with the Gospel of Thomas...it was the chief source of several other infancy gospels. Its original title appears to have been History of James Concerning the Birth of Mary; **ORIGEN REFERS TO IT AS THE BOOK OF JAMES**...It was first styled Protevangelium (i.e., Protogospel) of James by its sixteenth-century discoverer, Guillaume Postel. **THE EARLIEST CERTAIN REFERENCE TO THIS WRITING IS BY ORIGEN**, who cites it as the source of the tradition that Jesus’ brothers were ‘sons’ of Joseph by a former wife whom he had married before Mary’...’Now I, James, who wrote this history in Jerusalem, when there arose a tumult when Herod died, withdrew myself into the wilderness until the tumult ceased in Jerusalem. Glorifying the Lord God who gave me the gift and wisdom to write this history.’”

As you can clearly see, **THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS WERE VERY MUCH ACQUAINTED WITH THE PROTEVANGELIUM**, and this they understood the physical seduction of Eve by Satan as described in the quotation from said book above. We believe Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley, that Origen was indeed an “early church father.” Weakley uses some very

underhanded tactics is his unwarranted and groundless argument trying to prove the Two Seedliners in error. We will look at one of them now. On page 21 of his "The Satanic Seedline, Its doctrine and History," he tries his best (or maybe his worst) to mislead his readers. He tries in vain to convince them that the Seedliners are mistaken by quoting from "Matthew Henry's Commentary." In doing this, he does not name the volume or page as he so faithfully did with his other quotations. It is glaringly apparent he didn't want anyone to go to "Matthew Henry" and heck on him on this one. All he said was: "The best explanation for this is found in Matthew Henry's Commentary." After searching for some time, it was found that he was quoting from page 29 in volume 1 concerning Henry's comments on Genesis 3:14-15 and this is what he quoted: "Observe here, The serpent and the woman had just now been very familiar and friendly in discourse about the forbidden fruit, and a wonderful agreement there was between them; but here they are irreconcilably set at variance. Note, Sinful friendships justly end in mortal feuds: those that unite in wickedness will not unite long."

Weakley deliberately omitted Matthew Henry's remark just three paragraphs later on the next page (page 30), hoping you would never find where Matthew Henry says the following: "A perpetual quarrel is here commenced between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil among men; war is proclaimed between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent." The single seedliners always fall back on Genesis 4:1: "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD." (Genesis 4:1)

The New King James relates it this way: "Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, "I have acquired a man from the LORD." However, the single seedliners never pay any attention to the ";" after the word wife. In the King James Version. This ";" separates the first part of the verse from the rest of it.

So Adam knew Eve his wife, but there is no proof that she got pregnant from that union. A man can have intercourse with his wife many times and not get her pregnant; or he can have it one time and she becomes pregnant. Also in both verses she thought she had gotten a man child from the "Lord." She did not say that she got it from Adam, but she got it from the "Lord." Because she thought that Satan was a "lord" when he was talking to her and beguiled her.

How the single seedliners can say that the woman has seed that relates to Christ and then deny that the part about Satan having seed, is beyond belief. They pick and choose the parts of a verse they want to believe and discard the parts they don't want.

Genesis 3:16 has many children coming from Satan, not just Cain. Which the single seedliners never mention. In fact, there are many sons and daughters of Satan, but they are not called that.

We find the first mention of them in: "Certain men, **THE CHILDREN OF BELIAL**, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known." (Deuteronomy 13:13)

Now who is this Belial you ask? Well lets look at a couple of Bible commentaries and see what they have to say.

Belial: [BEE lih uhl] (worthlessness); **AN OLD TESTAMENT TERM DESIGNATING A PERSON AS GODLESS OR LAWLESS.** The NKJV translates corrupt (1 Samuel 2:12), perverted (Judges 19:22), rebel (2 Samuel 20:1), scoundrel (1 Kings 21:10,13), worthless men (1 Samuel 30:22), and worthless rogues (2 Samuel 16:7). A "daughter of Belial" (1 Samuel 1:16), (KJV) means a wicked woman (NKJV, NIV), one who is base (RSV) and worthless (NASB).

BELIAL SOMETIMES TAKES THE FORM OF A PROPER NAME (or a personification), APPLIED TO A DEMON OR TO SATAN (Nah. 1:15). MANY SCHOLARS BELIEVE THAT BELIAL IS ANOTHER NAME FOR SATAN.

(from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) (Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

Belial: BE'LIAL (be'li-al; "worthlessness, wickedness"). Belial is often used in the KJV as if it were a proper name, but beyond question it should not be regarded in the OT as such, its meaning being "worthlessness," and hence "recklessness, lawlessness."

The expression "son" or "man of Belial" must be understood as meaning simply a worthless, lawless fellow (Deuteronomy 13:13; Judg. 19:22; 20:13), see marg.; etc.)

In the NT the term appears (in the best manuscripts) in the form Belias, and not Belial, as given in the KJV. **THE TERM, AS USED IN (2 Corinthians 6:15), IS GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD AS APPLIED TO SATAN, AS THE PERSONIFICATION OF ALL THAT IS BAD.**

Belial occurs only once in the NASB and NIV (2 Corinthians 6:15). Elsewhere in those translations the Hebrew terms rendered "sons [or children] of Belial" in the KJV are given as "worthless men," "worthless fellows," or "wicked men," often with a marginal reading, "lit., sons of Belial." (from New Unger's Bible Dictionary) (originally published by Moody Press of Chicago, Illinois.

Copyright (C) 1988.)

Belial: (worthlessness): recklessness, lawlessness. Not strictly a proper name, but used so by personification. [Beli] = "without" and [ya'al] "usefulness," i.e. good for nothing. "A man of Belial" is a worthless, lawless fellow (Deuteronomy 13:13; Judges 19:22; 1 Samuel 2:12). Later [Raqal] ("vain fellows" (2 Samuel 6:20), [hareeqiyim]), and "Fool" were used instead: (Matthew 5:22). [Nabal] (= fool) is called "man of Belial" (1 Samuel 25:25) In the New Testament "Beliar" is the form in some oldest manuscripts (2

Corinthians 6:15) AS SATAN IS OPPOSED TO GOD, ANTICHRIST TO CHRIST, SO BELIAL STANDING HERE IN CONTRAST TO CHRIST MUST DENOTE ALL ANTI-CHRISTIAN POLLUTIONS PERSONIFIED. (from Fausset's Bible Dictionary)

When reading on in the scriptures after Deuteronomy 13:13, we see that Yahweh orders the children of Belial destroyed, every man, woman and child and all their goods: "Then shalt thou inquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and, behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you; **THOU SHALT SURELY SMITE THE INHABITANTS** (Yahweh is saying here all of the inhabitants of the city, the men, women and children they are so evil) **OF THAT CITY WITH THE EDGE OF THE SWORD, DESTROYING IT UTTERLY, AND ALL THAT IS THEREIN, AND THE CATTLE THEREOF, WITH THE EDGE OF THE SWORD.** And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof every whit, for the LORD thy God: and it shall be an heap for ever; it shall not be built again. And there shall cleave nought of the cursed thing to thine hand: that the LORD may turn from the fierceness of his anger, and shew thee mercy, and have compassion upon thee, and multiply thee, as he hath sworn unto thy fathers; When thou shalt hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep all his commandments which I command thee this day, to do that which is right in the eyes of the LORD thy God." (Deuteronomy 13:14-18)

The men and women of Belial were and are queers as the following verse attests: "Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, **BRING FORTH THE MAN THAT CAME INTO THINE HOUSE, THAT WE MAY KNOW HIM.**" (Judges 19:22)

The man of the house asked the queers to go away and leave him and the man alone and that they should not do such evil.

“And the man, the master of the house, went out unto them, and said unto them, Nay, my brethren, nay, I pray you, do not so wickedly; seeing that this man is come into mine house, do not this folly. Behold, here is my daughter a maiden, and his concubine; them I will bring out now, and humble ye them, and do with them what seemeth good unto you: but unto this man do not so vile a thing. But the men would not hearken to him: so the man took his concubine, and brought her forth unto them; and they knew her, and abused her all the night until the morning: and when the day began to spring, they let her go. Then came the woman in the dawning of the day, and fell down at the door of the man's house (she died from the abuse) where her lord was, till it was light. And her lord rose up in the morning, and opened the doors of the house, and went out to go his way: and, behold, the woman his concubine was fallen down at the door of the house, and her hands were upon the threshold. And he said unto her, Up, and let us be going. But none answered. Then the man took her up upon an ass, and the man rose up, and got him unto his place. And **WHEN HE WAS COME INTO HIS HOUSE, HE TOOK A KNIFE, AND LAID HOLD ON HIS CONCUBINE, AND DIVIDED HER, TOGETHER WITH HER BONES, INTO TWELVE PIECES, AND SENT HER INTO ALL THE COASTS OF ISRAEL.**” (Judges 19:23-29)

When he sent the pieces of the woman to the twelve tribes, one can just imagine what consternation it caused them. It caused such a furor that they had a meeting of all the tribes to see what they would do, to these evil men. “And it was so, that all that saw it said, There was no such deed done nor seen from the day that the children of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt unto this day: consider of it, take advice, and speak your minds.” (Judges 19:30)

So the Tribes of Israel had their meeting and it was decided that they would destroy the evil men that did this awful deed. They told Benjamin in the city to: “Now therefore deliver us the men, the children of Belial, which are in Gibeah, that we may put them to death, and put away evil from Israel. But the children

of Benjamin would not hearken to the voice of their brethren the children of Israel.” (Judges 20:13)

But the Benjamites would not deliver the evil sons of Belial to the other Israelites. And because of them not giving up the evil ones, the sons of Satan, the Jews who were called “Belial” all but a few of the tribe of Benjamin were destroyed.

“Now therefore deliver us the men, the children of Belial, which are in Gibeah, that we may put them to death, and put away evil from Israel. But the children of Benjamin would not hearken to the voice of their brethren the children of Israel.” (Judges 20:13)

Then because they would not hearken unto their brothers: “And the children of Benjamin said, They are smitten down before us, as at the first. But the children of Israel said, Let us flee, and draw them from the city unto the highways. And all the men of Israel rose up out of their place, and put themselves in array at Baaltamar: and the liers in wait of Israel came forth out of their places, even out of the meadows of Gibeah. And there came against Gibeah ten thousand chosen men out of all Israel, and the battle was sore: but they knew not that evil was near them. And the LORD smote Benjamin before Israel: and the children of Israel destroyed of the Benjamites that day twenty and five thousand and an hundred men: all these drew the sword. So the children of Benjamin saw that they were smitten: for the men of Israel gave place to the Benjamites, because they trusted unto the liers in wait which they had set beside Gibeah. And the liers in wait hasted, and rushed upon Gibeah; and the liers in wait drew themselves along, and smote all the city with the edge of the sword. Now there was an appointed sign between the men of Israel and the liers in wait, that they should make a great flame with smoke rise up out of the city. And when the men of Israel retired in the battle, Benjamin began to smite and kill of the men of Israel about thirty persons: for they said, Surely they are smitten down before us, as in the first battle. But when the flame began to arise up out of the city with a pillar of smoke, the

Benjamites looked behind them, and, behold, the flame of the city ascended up to heaven. And when the men of Israel turned again, the men of Benjamin were amazed: for they saw that evil was come upon them. Therefore they turned their backs before the men of Israel unto the way of the wilderness; but the battle overtook them; and them which came out of the cities they destroyed in the midst of them. Thus they inclosed the Benjamites round about, and chased them, and trode them down with ease over against Gibeah toward the sunrising. And there fell of Benjamin eighteen thousand men; all these were men of valour. And they turned and fled toward the wilderness unto the rock of Rimmon: and they gleaned of them in the highways five thousand men; and pursued hard after them unto Gidom, and slew two thousand men of them. So that all which fell that day of Benjamin were twenty and five thousand men that drew the sword; all these were men of valour. But six hundred men turned and fled to the wilderness unto the rock Rimmon, and abode in the rock Rimmon four months. And the men of Israel turned again upon the children of Benjamin, and smote them with the edge of the sword, as well the men of every city, as the beast, and all that came to hand: also they set on fire all the cities that they came to.” (Judges 20:32-48)

The children of Israel slew so many of the Tribe of Benjamin that they feared that Benjamin would cease to be a tribe; so they went to Yahweh and asked how they could remedy the situation as they had sworn that they would not give their daughters to Benjamin for wives. And Yahweh told them what to do and they did it, therefore Benjamin remained a tribe in Israel.

The sons or daughters are mentioned also in the following scriptures: 1 Samuel 1:16, 10:27, 25:17, 25:25, 30:22; 2 Samuel 16:7, 20:1, 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 21:13; 2 Chronicles 13:7; 2 Corinthians 6:15. And every time they are mentioned they are evil and are to be eventually destroyed.

There is no doubt that these are the children of Satan, just as was Cain. They were the descendants of Cain.

Belial: (be'-li-al), (bel'-yal) (beliya`al; Beliar): This name, occurring very frequently in the Old Testament, has the sense of "worthlessness" (compare (2 Samuel 23:6); accordingly in such phrases as "sons of Belial" (Judges 20:13; 1 Samuel 10:27, etc.), "Men of Belial" (1 Samuel 30:22; 1 Kings 21:13, etc.), which the English Revised Version usually retains, the American Standard Revised Version more correctly renders, "base fellows" (so "daughter of Belial" (1 Samuel 1:16), "wicked woman"). There is here no suggestion a proper name. **AFTERWARD, HOWEVER, "BELIAL" BECAME A PROPER NAME FOR SATAN, OR FOR ANTICHRIST** (thus frequently in the Jewish (should be rendered Israelite) Apocalyptic writings, e.g. in XII P, Book Jub, Asc Isa, Sib Or). In this sense Paul used the word in 2 Corinthians 6:15, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" (Beliar). Bousset thinks that Paul's "man of sin" in 2 Thessalonians 2:3, where some authorities read "man of lawlessness," is a translation of this term. The sense at least is similar. See **ANTICHRIST; MAN OF SIN. JAMES ORR** (from International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Electronic Database Copyright (C) 1996 by Biblesoft)

We have this from another commentary on the word Belial: David, "what a mean creature is he!" "Lord, what is man," may we say upon the reading of this story, "what a vile creature is he, when he is given up to his own heart's lusts!" **THE SINNERS ARE HERE CALLED SONS OF BELIAL, THAT IS, UNGOVERNABLE MEN, MEN THAT WOULD ENDURE NO YOKE, CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL** (for he is Belial), resembling him, and joining with him in rebellion against God and his government. (from Matthew Henry's Commentary)

So we can see that the Seedliners avoid the passages they can't explain away, and hang on to those that can be explained and shows that their beliefs are fallacious.

We Are At War

We would remind everyone who is not aware of it, we are in a **WAR**; not the one in Afghanistan. This **WAR** has been going on for about 7,000 years. This

WAR is between the **GENETIC** children of Yahweh and the **GENETIC** children of Satan; this **WAR** is between the White Children of Adam and Eve and the offspring of Satan through Cain whom we know today as “Jews.” Yes, the “Jews” are the literal progeny of Satan walking about today in shoe-leather. The “Jews” of today and the scribes and Pharisees of Messiah’s time should not be confused with the True Tribe of Judah.

The religion practiced by the Pharisees in Jesus’ time was based exclusively on the Babylonian Talmud. This, according to Rabbi Morris Kertzer, “The Talmud consists of 63 books of legal, ethical and historical writings of the ancient rabbis. It was edited five centuries after the birth of Jesus. It is a compendium of law and lore. **IT IS THE LEGAL CODE WHICH FORMS THE BASIS OF JEWISH RELIGIOUS LAW AND IT IS THE TEXTBOOK USED IN THE TRAINING OF RABBIS.**”

In his lifetime Michael Rodkinson, the assumed name of a “Jew” who was one of the world’s great authorities on the Talmud, wrote “History of the Talmud.” This classic on the subject was written by Michael Rodkinson in collaboration with the celebrated Rabbi Isaac M. Wise.

In his “History of the Talmud” Michael Rodkinson, on page 70, states: “Is the literature that Jesus was familiar with in his early years yet in existence in the world? Is it possible for us to get at it? Can we ourselves review the ideas, the statements, the modes of reasoning and thinking, **ON MORAL AND RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS**, which were current in his time, and **MUST HAVE BEEN EVALUATED BY HIM DURING THOSE THIRTY SILENT YEARS WHEN HE WAS PONDERING HIS FUTURE MISSION?** To such inquiries the learned class of Jewish rabbis **ANSWER BY HOLDING UP THE TALMUD ...** and the question becomes, therefore, an interesting one **TO EVERY CHRISTIAN**. What is the Talmud? **THE TALMUD, THEN, IS THE WRITTEN FORM OF THAT WHICH, IN THE TIME OF JESUS WAS CALLED THE TRADITIONS OF THE ELDERS AND TO WHICH HE MAKES FREQUENT ALLUSIONS.**”

Arsene Darmester in the book "The Talmud" states: "Judaism finds its expression in the Talmud, it is not a remote suggestion and a faint echo thereof, but it ... has become incarnate, in which it has taken form, passing from a state of abstraction into the domain of real things. The study of Judaism is that of the Talmud, as the study of the Talmud is that of Judaism ... they are two inseparable things ... they are one and the same ...the Talmud, is a complete expression of religious movement, and this code of endless presumptions and minute ceremonials represents in its perfection the total work of the religious idea ... The miracle was accomplished by a book, The Talmud ... "The Talmud is composed of two distinct parts the Mishna and the Gemara; the former the text, the latter a commentary upon the text...term Mishna we designate a collection of decisions and traditional laws embracing all departments of legislation, civil and religious ... "This code, the work of several generations of rabbis...nothing can equal the importance of the Talmud unless it be the ignorance that prevails concerning it...This explains how it happens that a single page of the Talmud contains three or four different languages, or rather specimens of one language at three or four stages of degeneracy...many a Mishna of five or six lines is accompanied by fifty or sixty pages of explanation ... is law in all its authority; it constitutes dogma and cult; it is the fundamental element of the Talmud... "The daily study of the Talmud which among Jews begins with the age of ten to end with life itself necessarily was a severe gymnastic for the mind, thinks to which it acquired incomparable subtlety and acumen...since it aspires to one thing: To establish for Judaism a 'Corpus Juris Ecclesiasticum!'"

John Lightfoot understood this when he wrote in his "A Commentary on the New Testament From the Talmud and Hebraica," volume 3, page 334 in reference to John 8:37: "From this whole period it is manifest that the while tendency of our Savior's discourse is to **SHEW THE JEWS THAT THEY ARE THE SEED OF THAT SERPENT** that was to bruise the heel of the Messiah: else what could that mean, ver. 44. 'Ye are of your father the devil,' but this, viz. 'Ye are the seed of the serpent?'"

Let's now take a look at John 8:38. While we do, let's remember that in verse 41 the "Jews" were very defensive of the implication of being "born of fornication." Being born of fornication implies being born of an impure racial union, Greek #4202. Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his "New Testament Word Study Dictionary," page 1201: "In John 8:41, 'We be not born of fornication' means, 'We are not spurious children, born of a concubine, but are the true descendants of Abraham.'"

Sure, the Arabs can claim Abraham as their father. We know, also, that the "Jews" of Messiah's day had absorbed Edomite blood, and therefore could claim both Abraham and Isaac as their fathers. The Shelanite-Judahites could even claim an affinity with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah, but that doesn't make them of the True Tribe of Judah. Now let's read that passage with that in mind: "They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Yahshua saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."

Verse 39 really clears up the whole matter. "The Holy Bible New Century Version," puts it very nicely in verse 39: "They answered, 'Our father is Abraham.' Jesus said, 'If you were really Abraham's children, you would do the things Abraham did.'"

A "Commentary On The Holy Bible," edited by Rev. J.R. Dummelow M.A., page 789 remarks on John 8:37 in this manner: "Their desire to kill Christ, the promised seed of Abraham, proved that they were not children of Abraham, but Satan."

"The Adam Clarke's commentary on the Bible," abridged by Ralph Earle, agrees with Dr. Lightfoot on John 8:37 as quoted here above: "My word hath no place in you. Or, 'this doctrine of Mine has no place in you.' You hear the truths of God [Yahweh] but you do not heed them; the word of life has no influence over you. And how can it when you seek to kill Me because I

proclaim this truth to you? From what is here said it is manifest, says Dr. Lightfoot, that the whole tendency of our Savior's discourse is to show the Jews that they are **THE SEED OF THE SERPENT** which was to bruise the heel of the Messiah. Else what could that mean, v. 44: 'Ye are of your father the devil' i.e., 'You are the **SEED OF THE SERPENT?**'"

Maybe, at this point, it would be well to consider Lightfoot's history. For this we shall go to his "A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica," volume 1, in the introduction, pages iii & iv: "Lightfoot was one of many earnest Christian scholars of his time. Master of St. Catherine Hall, Cambridge, he possessed the classical learning of those days. He was at home in Latin and Greek, and he was a master not only of classical Hebrew, but also of Mishnaic Hebrew and the Aramaic of the Talmud. We are reminded of his elder contemporary Lancelot Andrews, one of the translators of the King James Version of the Bible, who composed prayers for himself in Hebrew!

"Aside from Lightfoot's scholarly writings and productive teaching, he took part in the Westminster Assembly, which sat from 1643 to 1649. He belonged to the Eurasian party, favoring an established church, and this is reflected in the present work in his letter of thanks to Gilbert, who Lightfoot says is, 'by divine providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England.' Lightfoot lived in troubled times. Born in the last days of Queen Elisabeth, he was a boy when the King James Version was published. He sat in the Westminster Assembly while the Long Parliament beheaded King Charles I, then somehow survived the restoration under Charles II, all the while maintaining a real Christian testimony and making an important scholarly contribution to Scripture study. From his commentary one would hardly guess at the turbulent times in which he lived. One point of interest. In the days of Oliver Cromwell, when Lightfoot was at the height of his powers, the Jews were allowed again in England after 250 years of proscription (prohibition)."

From Lightfoot's comments on John 8:37, we can clearly see he understood the "Jews" were **THE SEED OF THE SERPENT** of Genesis 3:15. This is the same position as taken by the teachers of Two Seedline.

It seems, then, that Lightfoot understood the tenet of Two Seedline! But Mr. Jeffery A. Weakley, a fervently caustic anti-seedliner, in his booklet "The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History," page 15 says: "The Satanic Seedline doctrine was brought into the Identity teaching with San Jacinto Capt and Wesley A. Swift. Actually, San Jacinto Capt claimed he had gotten Wesley A. Swift started ... In any case, Wesley Swift presented the Seedline doctrine to Gerald L.K. Smith ... From there Swift got Bertrand Comparet started ... and shortly later San Jacinto Capt ... Introduced William P. Gale to Swift ..."

I submit that the Two Seedline doctrine has been around for quite a long time, and was **NOT** the invention of Capt, Swift, Comparet, or Gale as Weakley spuriously suggests. Now for some quotes from other commentaries on John 8:37: "Matthew Henry's Commentary," volume 5, page 997: "Now Christ overthrows this plea, and exposes the vanity of it by a plain and cogent argument: 'Abraham's children will do the works of Abraham, but you do not do Abraham's works, therefore you are not Abraham's children.' The proposition is plain: If you were Abraham's children, such children of Abraham as could claim an interest in the covenant made with him and his seed, which would indeed put an honour upon your, then you would do the works of Abraham, for to those only of Abraham's house who kept the way of the Lord, as Abraham did, would God [Yahweh] perform what he had spoken, Genesis 18:19."

"The Interpreter's Bible," volume 8, page 605: "Nonetheless, Christ's answer to them is grim indeed. You are not of God. You are of your father the devil, **AND HIS NATURE SHOWS ITSELF IN YOU**. He was a murderer from the beginning; and you seek to kill me; he has nothing to do with the truth, **AND**

TRUE TO YOUR BLOOD AND ANCESTRY, when and because I tell you the truth, you do not believe it, resent it, fling it from you.”

“Peake’s Commentary on the Bible,” page 855: “The Jews have described themselves as ‘descendants of Abraham;’ this leads to a second point. If they were truly Abraham’s children they would resemble their father; but in seeking to kill an innocent man, whose only crime is to speak the truth, they are unlike Abraham as could be Jesus [Yahshua] is the Son of God, and declares the truth he receives from God; but who can their father be/ The charge is repelled with a sneer; they [the Jews] are the children of God; Jesus) it is implied [by the Jews]) was born of fornication. This slander was current later; probably it was used in anti-Christian propaganda in John’s time, and perhaps earlier. But they [the Jews] are not God’s children; if they were, they would love his Son ... No, their father is the devil; that is why they seek to kill, and prefer falsehood to truth ...”

In chapter 2 of Jeffrey A. Weakley’s booklet “The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History,” he puts together a composition on words found in Genesis 3:6, 13 and 4:1. These words are: tree, food, desired, took, fruit, eat, beguiled and knew. It will be necessary here to give this chapter a critical review, for some of the conclusions in his research are sadly faulty. Actually, Weakley proved Two Seedline in many ways rather than disproving it, and you will see what we mean as we go along. At this time, we will consider the word “tree” in his presentation. Eventually, it is hoped that we will cover this entire chapter. It’s simply amazing, for Weakley doesn’t believe or understand some of his own research: “We will now look at the Satanic Seedline doctrine as compared to Scripture. Any teaching that we hear should not be accepted or rejected as truth until we have reexamined the Scriptures. This is what the Bereans did in Acts 17:10-11. So let us now be ‘more noble’ as the Bereans and search the Scriptures on this matter. The first point of the Seedline doctrine is that Eve was sexually seduced. In Genesis 3:6 we find: ‘And when the woman say that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof,

and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.' Now according to the seedliners, this passage is just written with good taste and is really talking about a sexual encounter. Let's see. First we'll examine some words in this very: tree: (ets_ ð a tree (from its firmness); hence wood.

(Strong's concordance) ð (1) a tree (follows analogy of the verb atsh, to be hard, firm) (2) wood, specially of a wooden post, stake, gibbet. (Gesenius' Lexicon) ð tree, wood, timber, stock, plank, stalk, stick, gallows. (Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, edited by R. Laird Harris). This Hebrew word is translated over 100 times in the Old Testament as:

tree(s), 'wood,' 'timber,' 'sticks,' 'helve,' 'stalks,' 'staff,' 'gallows,' 'stock(s),' and 'plank.'

From the above, I find it difficult to believe that this tree from which Eve obtained the fruit was anything other than a tree."

I will agree with Mr. Jeffrey A. Weakley that it is paramount that we should examine and reexamine the Scriptures. And, yes, the Two Seedliners do point to Genesis 3:6 as a sexual encounter with Satan, at least on the part of Eve. Yes, the word "tree" as used in this verse means a hard, firm or solid tree such as wood, timber, stocks, helve, stakes, gallows, stock, or plank. As a matter of fact, the counterpart word for the Hebrew #6086 (tree) is #3586 in the Greek and means the same thing. The problem, though, for understanding the "trees" of Genesis 3 is in the Hebrew Idiom. George M. Lamsa in his booklet "Idioms In The Bible Explained," points out, page ix, that both the "tree of knowledge" and the "tree of life" have sexual connotations. In addition, Lamsa said this in his introduction: "I chose the King James text from which to pick the idioms quoted in this book (unless otherwise indicated), because the King James text is the most widely used Bible translation in the English speaking world. Moreover, the King James translators were more faithful to the texts from which they translated into English, making fewer additions and omissions than later English version translators and revisors. They translated many Eastern idioms and metaphors literally, not knowing their true meaning. For instance, 'You shall handle snakes.' They did not know that the word

'snake' refers to 'an enemy.' "Beware of dogs" was not understood to be 'beware of gossipers,' in Semitic languages."

So we can observe very quickly Weakley is taking literally the idioms of Genesis 3, as did the KJV translators when they translated many of the Hebrew and Greek idioms in a literally manner. The bottom line is: if one cannot understand the idiom, one cannot understand the Bible, in numerous cases. As we go along, you will find that Weakley discovered many idiomatic expressions in various places of his research and refused to accept their idiomatic meanings. He did this mainly **BECAUSE THE LITERAL MEANINGS OUTNUMBERED FIGURATIVE MEANINGS.**

Literal Trees, or Figurative Trees?

Maybe we can find what the "tree of knowledge of good and evil" is if we first investigate the meaning of the "tree of life." In both cases, the word for tree is #6086, meaning **LITERALLY** a firm wooden tree. In the various Bible commentaries and dictionaries there are a multitude of ideas on what the "tree of life" might be.

It really goes back to Weakley's definition of a wooden tree. As stated before, the counterpart word in the Greek is #3586, and means literally a wooden tree. In Dr. Spiros Zodhiates' "New Testament Word Study Dictionary," he says this on page 1023 concerning #3586, (xulon)

"In Revelation 2:7; 22:2, 14, it is conceivable that the 'tree of life' may be an allusion to the cross and could be rendered 'wood of life' (a.t.) Sept.: Genesis 1:11-12, 2:9."

This makes a lot of sense in other words, the wooden tree represents the wooden cross (whatever kind of device it might have been) on which our Messiah wrought Redemption! And how else do we "eat" of "the tree of life" but by the partaking of Communion? Inasmuch as a few Bible scholars understood it this way, let's now consider some of their comments:

“Nelson’s Illustrated Bible dictionary,” page 1072, under the topic “TREE OF LIFE:” “Adam and Eve’s inability to eat from this tree after their sin showed that they failed to gain immortality, or eternal life. Because of their sin, they were subject to death and dying. This condition lasted until the coming of Jesus Christ [Yahshua], the second Adam, who offers eternal life to all [of Adam] who believe in Him.” (1 John 5:11-12)

“Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible,” volume 3, page 1008:
“... That they may have right to the tree of life; to Christ, called before, the tree of life, [Revelation 22] ver. 2, by virtue of the promise, chap ii. 7, for no works of ours will give us a right of purchase to it. And may enter in through the gates into the city ...”

“A Commentary On The Holy Bible,” edited by Rev. J.R. Dummelow M.A., page 10: “... the fruit of His perfect obedience, and have a right to the TREE OF LIFE. ‘As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.’”
Can you now see that Weakley, in refusing to see the Hebrew idiom, is insisting that our Messiah was a wooden tree? Not only was our Savior not a wooden tree, but neither was “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” To follow up on the theme of the “tree of life,” let’s quote some different passages where it is mentioned: “For many great miseries shall be done to them (Israel) that in the latter time shall dwell in the world, because they have walked to great pride. But understand thou for thyself, and seek out the glory of such as be like thee. For unto you is paradise opened, THE TREE OF LIFE is planted, the time to come is prepared, plenteousness is made ready, a city is builded, and rest is allowed, yea, perfect goodness and wisdom.” (2 Esdras 8:50-52)
Testament Of Levi as found in “The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden:”

“And he shall open the gates of paradise, and shall remove the threatening sword against Adam, and he shall give to the saints to eat from the TREE OF LIFE, and the spirit of holiness shall be on them. And Beliar shall be bound by him, and he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits. And

the Lord (Yahweh) shall rejoice in His children, and be well pleased in His beloved ones for ever. Then shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob exult, and I will be glad, and all the saints shall clothe themselves with joy. And now, my children, ye have heard all; choose, therefore for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord (Yahweh) or the works of Beliar.”
(Testament of Levi 5:26-30)

Once we comprehend that YAHSHUA THE MESSIAH is the TREE OF LIFE, our apprehension is opened up for us and our understanding comes to life. Notice verse 30 speaks of both “light” and “darkness;” the very same forces which are at WAR with each other in our world today. Beliar is another name for Satan. These two trees in Eden were not literal wooden trees, but walking, talking & breathing metaphorically idiomatic trees representing genetic people. The “tree of life” was Yahshua the Messiah and the “tree of knowledge of good and evil” was Beliar or Satan.

Such family trees are described in Mark: “And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw aught. And he looked up, and said, I see **MEN WAS TREES WALKING.**” (Mark 8:22-24) It seems this former blind man had better eyesight than the anti-seedliners of today. It is simply amazing, as the anti-seedliners of today dance up and down and insist that there is only one seed in Genesis 3:15, and that seed is only one man, Yahshua. It takes **TWO** to have **ENMITY**, as enmity means: **MUTUAL** hatred. Mutual means: give or felt by one another in equal amount. The word for “enmity” in Genesis 3:15 is the Hebrew word #342, and is found also in Numbers 35:21-22; Ezekiel 25:15; 35:5-6, and in every case, two parties are involved. The only way, therefore, for Genesis 3:15 to be speaking of “one seed” is if the Redeemer were to hate Himself. Can you see now how ridiculous such a premise is, that the anti-seedliners promote? They have really backed themselves into a corner on that one! Then, they rant and rave that there wasn’t anything sexual concerning Eve’s seduction, but that it was

all a matter of mental seduction. They insist it is all an invention of the Two seedliners.

That there are others who interpret the seduction of Eve in a sexual manner, let's refer to "The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible," volume R-Z, page 696. While this publication does not take a stand on the subject one way or the other, at least it points out that this is one of the interpretations; "Sexual knowledge. The tree of knowledge is the means to sexual knowledge. The advocates of this interpretation have pointed out that the verb (Strong's #3045), 'know' occurs frequently as a euphemism for sexual relations (Genesis 4:1; 19:5). When Adam and Eve acquired the knowledge of good and evil, they recognized their nakedness and experienced feelings of shame. Finally, several parallel passages containing the phrase 'knowing good and evil' can be reasonably interpreted as referring to sexual knowledge. (Deuteronomy 1:39; 2 Samuel 19:35; "1QSa," abbr. for "Rule of the congregations."(?))

Matthew Poole states on Deuteronomy 1:39: "Had no knowledge between good and evil; a common description of the state of childhood, as Jonah 4:11."

One unnamed anti-seedliner said: "Most seedliners go wrong at this point by correlating the eating or touching of the fruit of the tree to intercourse. But, when Adam received his directions from God, there was no female around for intercourse, so how could these words be made to imply sexual activity. Now, where does that leave these speculators (meaning Two Seedliners)?" We will next see this is not speculation, on our part, concerning the words "eating" and "touching" having sexual connotations. The first of the anti-seedliners as far as I know is Stephen E. Jones, in his 1978 book "The Babylonian connection," to take issue with the Two Seedliners.

You may well ask, then, what is the purpose for my writing about this anyway? The answer to this question is: I am duty bound by Yahweh's Law to witness

to the truth to the best of my ability as I understand it. In other words, if I know a crime has been committed, in the process of being committed or there is a danger of a crime about to be committed, if I do not witness to what I know, I am as guilty as the person committing the crime. In this case, we are not talking about a single individual crime, we are talking about tens of thousands of crimes. The news of these crimes has been withheld from the public by the usual news media and writers of the past. The law concerning the witness of a crime is found in Leviticus 5:1 which reads: "And if a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is a witness whether he hath seen or know of it; IF HE DO NOT UTTER it, then he shall bear his iniquity."

A second Scripture which commands us to expose the truth is found in Ephesians 5:11, which says: "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."

"The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge," edited by Jerome H. Smith says this on page 132: "...such an one shall bear his iniquity — shall be considered as guilty in the sight of God of the transgression which he has endeavored to conceal, and must expect to be punished for hiding the iniquity with which he was acquainted."

I refuse, therefore, to sit idly by and share the guilt for these crimes with our enemy. The anti-seedliners, by not identifying the enemy, are sharing equally in these crimes with the "Jews." By taking this stance, they are actually doing more damage than the "Jews" are implementing. They are, in practice, partaking of these "Jewish" crimes.

Inasmuch as I have put in a very considerable amount of time studying in the last several years and know the nature of the enemy, I find it my duty to inform whoever I can of who our opponent is and his agenda. I find it is quite difficult when there are hecklers in the background implying we don't have an enemy. The anti-seedliners venomously deny this message and they will go to any length to discredit this obvious truth.

One of the devious ploys the anti-seedliners implement is to point out that the Two Seedline message can be found in the Babylonian Talmud. By doing this, they hope to catch you off guard by implying everything in the Talmud is 100% false. Also their aim is to establish **GUILT BY ASSOCIATION**. When such a maneuver is practiced, one is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Stephen E. Jones used this type of stratagem in his book "The Babylonian Connection," page 142, when he quoted the Talmud, Yebamoth, 103-103b: "When the serpent copulated with Eve he infused her with lust. The lust of the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai came to an end, the lust of idolaters who did not stand at Mount Sinai did not come to an end."

Again, Jones quoted Yebamoth, 63a: "R. Eleasar further stated: What is meant by the Scripture text, 'This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh?'"

Jones then keyed in on a "Jewish" footnote: "This teaches that Adam had intercourse with every beast and animal but found no satisfaction until he cohabited with Eve."

Jeffrey A. Weakley, in his "The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History," page 20, also quotes the Talmud Yebamoth 103b as did Stephen E. Jones. Both Jones and Weakley do not quote this passage in its entirety. In this passage from the Talmud, there are numbers from 4 to 11 which are explained later in footnotes. I will now quote this entire passage with the footnotes incorporated in brackets from my copy of the Soncino Talmud: "There (4) [In the warning to Laban] one can see the reason (5) [Why even good should not be spoken] since he (6) [Laban] might possibly mention to him the name of his idol; (7)[Cf. Genesis 31:30] what evil, however, could be involved here? (8) [In the incident with Jael] That of infusing her with sensual lust. For R. Johanan stated: When the serpent copulated with Eve, (9) [In the Garden of Eden, according to a tradition] he infused her (10) [i.e., the human species] with lust. The lust of the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai, (11) [And experienced the purifying influence of divine Revelation] came to an end,

the lust of the idolaters who did not stand at Mount Sinai did not come to an end.”

Both Jones and Weakley quote from the Zohar, the “sacred” book of the Cabala, which is separate from the Talmud. Neither Jones nor Weakley seem to be quoting directly from the Zohar, but indirectly from “The Talmud Unmasked,” by Rev. I.B. Pranaitis, page 52. If this is the case, neither one quotes this passage faithfully; such as using the proper italics where it shows. I will now quote this passage exactly as Pranaitis presents it: “In Zohar (I, 28b) we read: ‘Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, etc. (Genes. III, I) ‘More subtle’ that is towards evil; ‘than all the beasts’ that is, the idolatrous people of the earth. For they are the children of the ancient serpent which seduced Eve.’ The best argument used by the Jews to prove Christians are of a race of the devil is the fact that they are uncircumcised. The foreskin of the non-Jews prevents them from being called the children of the Most High God. For by circumcision the name of God — Schaddai — is completed in the flesh of a circumcised Jew. The form of the letter Isch is in his nostrils, the letter Daleth in his (bent) arm, and ain appears in his sexual organ by circumcision. In non-circumcised gentiles, therefore, such as Christians, there are only the two letters Isch and Daleth, which make the word Sched, which means devil. They are, therefore, children of the Sched, the Devil.”

A “Jew” could be circumcised a hundred times and it would not bring him under the Covenant. If anything, this passage proves Two Seedline, as the “enmity” of Genesis 3:15 is clearly evident, and is at work here; but the “Jews” have everything backward as they are the ones who are the children of the devil. Ted R. Weiland in his booklet “Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?” quotes one other passage from the Talmud, Shabbath 146a: “For when the serpent came upon Eve he injected lust into her.”

If the purpose of the anti-seedliners is to use the old worn-out accusation of guilt by association, they could have used more references from the Talmud. Here are some passages they could have used for their ambiguous claims:

“The idea is that the serpent infected Eve (i.e., the human race) with lust, from which, however, those who accept the moral teachings of the torah are freed.” (Shabbath 146a)

“In cursing we commence with the least; first the serpent was cursed then Eve and then Adam!” (Berachoth 61a)

“I will kill Adam and marry Eve; but now, I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. Similarly do we find it with Cain, Koran, Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, Gehazi, Absalom, Adonijah, Uzziah and Haman, who set their eyes upon that which was not proper for them; what they sought was not granted to them and what they possessed was taken from them.” (Sotah 9b)

“When the serpent came unto Eve he infused filthy lust into her.” (Avodah Zarah 22b)

Is There Any Truth in the Talmud?

The anti-seedliners base their whole argument on the premise that anything found in the Talmud has to be entirely false. As a matter of fact, this is their ace in the hole, so they think. All they have to do is point out that the Two Seedline doctrine is found in the Talmud, and magically, the teaching is condemned in many people's minds. It is not my goal here to defend and uphold the majority of the contents found in these books. It is well recognized they are the most evil books ever written. But we must even give the devil his just dues. If the Two Seedline doctrine is condemned for being part of the writings of the Talmud then all of their contents are condemned. Let's take a look at a few passages found in them: “... Judah [is called] a lion's whelp; of Dan [It is said] Dan shall be a serpent, Naphtali [is called] a hind let loose; Issachar a strong ass; Joseph a firstling bullock; Benjamin a wolf that ravineth. [Of those sons of Jacob where a comparison with an animal] is written in connection with them, it is written; but [in the instances where such

a comparison] is not written, there is the text: What was thy mother? A lioness; she counced among lions etc.” (Sotah 11b)

Well, what do you know; who would have ever thought there was anything like that in the Talmud? It would appear the anti-seedliners are going to have to reject the main tenants of Israel Identity because they can be found in the Talmud. Maybe they will have to go back to Judeo-churchianity. They are going to have to take a black permanent marker and blot out the entire chapter of Genesis 49 along with all the cross-references, all because it can be found in the Talmud. If they blot out Judah, there goes the Redeemer. Are you beginning to see how ridiculous an argument the anti-seedliners advocate? Can you see now how dangerous the ploy of **GUILT BY ASSOCIATION** can be? Actually, it's a “Jewish’ kind of trick. Well, let's see what else we might find in the Talmud: “He is worthy of inheritance of two tribes’: He is worthy of an inheritance like Joseph, as it is written: Joseph is a fruitful bough...whose branches run over the wall; he is also worthy of the inheritance of Issachar, as it is written: Issachar is a strong ass. There are some who say, His enemies will fall before him, as it is written: With them he shall push the people together, to the ends of the earth. He is worthy of understanding like Issachar, as it is written: And the children of Issachar which were men that had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do.” (Baba Kama 17a)_

Isn't it simply amazing what can be found in the Talmud? If we use the argument of the anti-seedliners, we are going to get in all kinds of trouble. If we apply their hypothesis, we will have to destroy most of Yahweh's written Word. One very adamant unyielding anti-seedliner is Lt. Col. Jack Mohr, AUS Ret. Who wrote a pamphlet entitled “Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?” He used this same worn-out tactic of **GUILT BY ASSOCIATION** when he said on page 8: “Now this is pretty far fetched, I think, for it is the same teaching you find in the Babylonian Talmud, and in most heathen ‘phallic religions’ of the Far East. Wise [James E. Wise] implies that the **FRUIT** of the trees of knowledge of good and evil, was sexual union, even though the Hebrew word

for 'fruit,' as it is used here (#6529), means 'Bough; fruitful; reward.' There is hardly any room here for any sexual interpretation of the word, unless your mind is sexually oriented. Then I guess you can see sex in anything. Certain the SEEDLINERS SEE SEX IN THIS PASSAGE. Shows you where their mind is, doesn't it?" (Note: Gesenius' includes "offspring" for #6529)

By the way, judging from his article, Jack Mohr believes that the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil were wooden trees; that the serpent was an ordinary snake and the fruit was simply some kind of fruit from some fruit tree. Thus, Jack Mohr, in implying this, makes the tree of life (the Messiah) a wooden tree. You will also notice that Jack Mohr points a finger at James E. Wise. It seems it is quite all right for the anti-seedliners to name names, but it is anathema for the Two Seedliners. More on Jack Mohr later, but for now, back to the Talmud: "And the sons of Zerah: Zimri, Ethan and Erman and Calcole and Darda, five in all. Why the phrase: five of them in all? Because all five were equally destined for the world to come ..."

Are we now supposed to throw out the entire Zerah branch of Judah because it can be found in the Talmud? If you listen to the anti-seedliners, this is their premise. In other words, the very mention of anything found in the Talmud automatically labels it as an evil teaching.

"Why are the years of Ishmael mentioned? So as to reckon by them the years of Jacob, as it is written, And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty and seven years. How much older was Ishmael than Isaac? Fourteen years, as it is written, And Abram was fourscore and six years old when Hagar bore Ishmael to Abram, and it is also written, And Abraham was a hundred years old when his son Isaac was born to him, and it is written, And Isaac was threescore years old when she bore them. How old then was Ishmael when Jacob was born? Seventy-four. How many years were left of his life? Sixty-three; and it has been taught: Jacob our father at the time when he was blessed by his father was sixty-three years old. It was just at that time that Ishmael died, as it is written, Now Esau saw that Isaac

had blessed Jacob ... so Esau went unto Ishmael and took Mahlath the daughter of Ishmael Abraham's son the sister of Nebaioth.

"Now once it has been said, 'Ishmael's daughter' do I not know she was the sister of Nebaioth? This tells us that Ishmael affianced (engaged) her and then died, and Nebaioth her brother gave her in marriage. Sixty-three and fourteen till Joseph was born make seventy-seven, and it is written, And Joseph was thirty-three years old when he stood before Pharaoh. This makes a hundred and seven. Add seven years of plenty and two of famine, and we have a hundred and sixteen, and it is written, And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, How many are the days of the years of thy life? And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my sojournings are a hundred and thirty years .

"But [we have just seen that] they were only a hundred and sixteen? We must conclude therefore that he spent fourteen years in the house of Eber, as it has been taught: 'After Jacob our father had left for Aram Naharaim two years. Eber died. 'He then went forth from where he was and came to Aram Naharaim. From this it follows that when he stood by the well he was seventy-seven years old. And how do we know that he was seventy-seven years old? As it has been taught: 'We find that Joseph was away from his father twenty-two years, just as Jacob our father was absent from his father.' But Jacob's absence was thirty-six years? It must be then that the fourteen years which he was in the house of Eber are not reckoned."

While I have not checked this entire passage for error, it appears this part of the Talmud could be used as a valuable tool for figuring badly needed chronology. While I know the "Jews" cannot call Jacob their father through the Covenant, the evidence presented here could be used to confirm much of what is not recorded in our present Bibles.

Therefore, I believe some passages from the Talmud would be creditable to our research, if we are careful how we use them, the Two Seedline doctrine without exception. I have several other passages of the Talmud which I could quote to enforce my position, but I think, by this time, you can see my point. In

fact, if I were to use key words in the Old testament and run them in the search mode of my copy the Talmud on CD-R in my computer, no doubt, I could come up with at least 500 examples of truth contained within these writings. While I do not recommend the Talmud as a good source of inspiration, nevertheless, it is not 100% totally false information as the anti-seedliners imply. I only wish I had a copy of the Zohar on CD-R. Some might condemn me for studying the Talmud, but how else can we be as “wise as serpents” unless we know what the enemy has written? After all, I don’t hear anyone condemning Rev. I.B. Pranaitis, Henry Ford or Elizabeth Dilling. This is the seventh in a series of Special Notices to all anti-seedliners who are opposed to the proposition that there are a literal walking, talking, breathing, genetic Satanic seedline people among us in the world To proclaim otherwise is a declaration that we have no enemy, and neutralizes and undermines our defenses against them. To concede such a position is beyond all responsible comprehension, and only those who assume the obligation of pointing out and identifying the enemy are Israel’s true watchmen. To brazenly obstruct the message of the true watchmen’s warnings is the height of treason. The judgment for interfering with the true watchman in his appointed duty is not a very pretty one. But, sad to say, this is what many are doing. Again, we would warn you, we are at WAR. This WAR has been going on now for over 7,000 years. It is a WAR between Yahweh and His children and Satan and his children. It is a battle to the death for one or the other.

In analyzing some of the single seedliners writings on their anti-seedline argument, one can make some interesting observations. We notice that they are working with a limited source of information. It is obvious they only use Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible along with some unnamed Bible dictionary.

It also appears they are quoting entirely from the King James Version. Equipped with this limited source of data, they desire to dictate to everyone else their own unqualified views which are based on their personal reasoning. From what we can observe so far, if they don’t like what they read in Strong’s

they will switch to this unnamed Bible dictionary in order to pick and choose that which best suits “their” likes. It is conspicuously oblivious they did this with the meaning of Seth’s name.

In order to show you the next place in their writings it will be necessary for us to quote a couple of paragraphs from a booklet ‘Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative,’ page 11: “... But Wise (James E. Wise) states again without any Scriptural backing, when Eve states ‘I have gotten a man from the Lord,’ she thought Cain was her firstborn and she thought he was the promised seed, she later acknowledged that Abel, not Cain, was the promised see. Therefore, if Abel was her promised seed, than Cain would have to be the seed or progeny (sic, progeny) of the serpent. There is absolutely no Scriptural evidence which indicates that Eve thought that Abel was the ‘promised seed.’ Verse 25, which Wise quotes as confirmation of this statement merely says that when Eve had Seth, she said: ‘God has appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.’ She is merely stating that God gave her a son to replace the one who had been killed. Nothing is said here about ‘promised seed.’ 1 John 3:12 does not ‘plainly denote that Cain was the offspring or progeny of the wicked one.’ The Bible Dictionary says the word Cain means ‘acquisition,’ which means: ‘the act of having one’s own; to get or gain through one’s efforts.’ Seth means to ‘compensate; a sprout,’ it has nothing whatsoever to do with being s substitute as Wise avers. We wonder where this man got his information or if he just dreamed it up, the latter seems the more possible.”

The last statement here, concerning the name of Seth, highly suggests his own theological dishonesty. We will show you why. As we know, according to their own words, they have both a Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible and an unnamed Bible dictionary. They said on page 3: “The word ‘serpent’ as used here and throughout this chapter is #5175 in Strong’s Concordance ...”

From this statement we can irrevocably conclude beyond all doubt that they have a copy of the Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of The Bible. The question is: why didn't they quote from it in this instance? Again, their statement is: "Seth means to 'compensate; a sprout,' it has nothing whatsoever to do with being a substitute as Wise avers."

This is what the Strong's Concordance has to say of the name Seth: #8352 ... Seth, shayth; from #7896; put, i.e., substitute, Seth, third son of Adam: Seth, Sheth." If you will notice very carefully, it speaks of the meaning as beint "substitute" and mentions absolutely nothing about "compensate" or "sprout." You can even go to the word #7896 from which #8352 is taken and it suggest no such meaning. Furthermore, "Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament," agrees with Strong's on both words. You will find #7896 on page 819 of Gesenius'. Upon examining 33 sets of Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, only on which even remotely suggests a meaning of "sprout." These last meanings seems to be an invention of a person by the name of Ewald, see Unger's, page 999. Outside of these two references, most all of the other dictionaries/encyclopedias and commentaries are generally agreed to the meaning of Seth as "substitute" or "in place of." We submit that these teachers had both of these meanings before them, yet they rejected Strong's in favor to their unnamed Bible dictionary in order to, what appears to be, fabricate his point, which they thought nobody would ever notice. This is the epitome of blatant, unabashed, brazen treachery and deceitfulness of the most evil kind.

Now for a few references to show that James E. Wise was correct when he made his statement that Seth was a "substitute" or "appointed" in place of Abel.

"The Pictorial Bible Dictionary," by Merrill C. Tenny, general editor, page 774: "SETH (seth, Heb. Sheth [so KJV in Numbers 24:17; 1 Chronicles 1:1) ... His name (meaning 'appointed,' i.e., 'substitute') signifies that he was considered a 'substitute' for Abel (Genesis 4:12). His birth recalled man's tragic loss of

divine image (Genesis 5:1). He became the founder of the line of faith.”
(Genesis 4:25; Luke 3:38).

“The Wycliffe Bible Commentary,” page 11: “The Hebrew word shows marked similarity to the word shat, translated ‘appointed’ or ‘et.’ In reality, Seth became the one on whom God could depend as the foundation stone for His family. He was ‘set’ or ‘appointed’ to take up the word and mission of Abel.”

“The Adam Clarke’s Commentary,” abridged by Ralph Earle: “Eve must have received on this occasion some divine communication, else how could she have known that this son was appointed in the place of Abel, to continue that holy line by which the Messiah was to come?”

“Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible,” volume 1, page 14:
“Instead of Abel; to succeed his father Adam, as Abel should have done in the priesthood, and administration and care of holy things in the church of God.”

“The New World Dictionary Concordance to the New American Bible,” page 619: “... The name is explained in popular ethnology which sees it deriving from the verb sith, to replace. Eve stated ‘God has granted me another offspring in place of Abel.’”

Let’s take a look at what on Identity Preacher said about Wise on page 12:
“But let’s analyze Genesis 4:1 very carefully and see what it really says, not what some man [Wise] thinks it says. Read it for yourself, it is very clear. I can find no hint in this chapter, that even [sic., Eve] thought Abel was the ‘promised seed.’ How can he [Abel] have been when he was killed. Do you mean that God would have given a ‘promised seed’ to Eve, only to be murdered? It doesn’t make much sense, does it? The promised seed was ‘Seth,’ who god gave her to take the place of Abel. It become a gross assumption on the part of the author [Wise], when he states: ‘because of this, Cain could only have been the progeny of the serpent.’ When we quote the 1 John 3:12 verse about Can ‘wicked one,’ we see verse 12 in its context, it cannot be lifted out of its proper setting just to prove a point that someone wants to make ...”

This author is totally lacking any insight on this one, we believe. We have read several references which show that Seth was an appointed seed in Abel's place, and this is the very meaning of Seth's name. If Abel was not a promised seed, there would have been no need for his blood to cry from the ground.

Why, then, did Abel's blood cry from the ground? Abel's blood was crying for revenge. Seth became the revenger of blood for Abel. Yahshua became the ultimate revenger of that blood, and will, in time, destroy all of the descendants of Cain. This whole WAR is a blood-feud. The revenger of blood is spoken of in Numbers 35:19: "The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer: when he meeteth him, he shall slay him."

If one continues to shoot one's self in the foot long enough, one will find one doesn't have a leg to stand on. This is exactly what Jack Mohr is doing, as he shoots himself in the foot again on page 20. As he attempts to show you his thoughts on the subject of race, where we believe he goofs again. This is what he said: "Here again we see Wise (James E. Wise) as he does some more 'supposing,' when he states that the word generation could be translated Race. If you check your Strong's Concordance, you will find the word generation has five meanings. In the Old Testament we find the Hebrew word ('daur' #1755, which means; 'an age; a dwelling;' posterity.') It is used thusly in Genesis 7:1: 'And the Lord said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.' 9Nothing here to do with RACE!) We find a second meaning to the word in Daniel 4:3 where the word is (#1850 'dar' meaning 'generation' In the New Testament, three Greek words are used for generation. In Matthew 1:1: 'The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ ...'

Here the word is 'genesis,' (#1078) which means: 'nativity; figurative, nature; generation'). In Matthew 3:7 we read: 'O generation of vipers, who hath warned thee to flee from the wrath to come?' (Here the Greek word is

'gennema:' #1081, meaning; 'offspring: produce; fruit; generation') finally in Matthew 12:41 we read: 'The men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it.' (Here the word is 'genea' #1974 [sic, #1074], meaning: 'a generation; an age; nation; time'). This is the only occasion in the entire Bible where the word generation could mean RACE, but we see from the context that this is not what it means here. Once again, Wise has borne 'false witness' to what a word means."

As you will shortly see, the "false witness" is not James E. Wise but Jack Mohr. Let's start with the Hebrew word #1755 which Jack Mohr mistakenly interprets. "Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies," page 184 says this concerning this word. (The Hebrew characters are exactly the same as shown in Strong's): "... an age, a generation of men a race of men contemporary, Genesis 6:9, or implying conformity, Proverbs 30:10-14. So it may be understood in that disputed passage, Isaiah 53:8, 'his generation,' the race conformed to the Messiah, equivalent to 'the seed,' verse 10: Genesis 6:9, all generations, Heb. Generation and generation; every generation. Heb. Id...Daniel 4:3, 3, 34, 34." Continuing now with the "Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament," on the Hebrew word #1755. Among the other meanings Gesenius' says this on page 194: "The idea of age, or generation being neglected, it often means a race of men..."

We will not go into every Strong's number reference that Jack Mohr mentions here. However, it should be obvious, from this last example, that he doesn't have the slightest idea of what he is talking about concerning the Old Testament. Let's see what he says about the New Testament, besides that which is quoted above. If you will recall, he is saying the only verse in the Bible that can be rendered "race" is Matthew 12:41, and there he states that it doesn't mean "race" in that case either. In other words, he is, in effect saying there is not one case in the entire Bible that refers to race.

Now that bold statement. Let's see if it will hold up under the magnifying glass. In "The Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament," by Spiros

Zodhiates, the Greek word #1078, genesis, is described in part as: "In the passive genesis means race, lineage, equivalent to gena (#1074), genealogy, book of genealogy ..." Zodhiates then describes the Greek word #1974, genea in part: "Metaphorically spoken of the people of any generation or age, those living in any one period, a race or class ..." You can see by this which very clearly, is contrary to what Jack Mohr says, these two words, genesis and genea, do imply race.

On page 22 of the booklet Jack Mohr says: "God had appointed His Israel people to be a 'special, holy people' who according to 1 Peter 2:9 were to be: 'a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar (set aside for a special purpose); that ye (Israel) should show forth the praises of Him who called you out of darkness, into His marvelous light.'"

If Jack Mohr had had an "American Standard Version of the Bible," he could have observed that "chosen generation" in this particular verse is rendered an "elect race." He is way off base when he claims: "This is the only occasion in the entire Bible where the word 'generation' could mean 'race,' but we see from the context that this is not what it means here." Evidently he is unaware of how to find the subject of race in the Bible. If we will turn to the word "generation" in W.E. Vine's "An Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Word," it will direct us to go to page 291 for the word "kind."

Here is what it says under this heading: "GENOS ... akin to ginomai, to become, denotes (a) a family, Acts 4:6. 'Kindred;' 7:13, R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'kindred'); 13:26, 'stock;' (b) offspring, Acts 17:28; Revelations 22:16; (c) a nation, a race, Mark 7:26, R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'nation') ; Acts 4:36, R.V. '(a man of Cyprus) by race,' A.V., 'of the country of Cyprus;' genos does not mean a country, the word signifies parentage (Jews[?]) had settled in Cyprus from, or even before, the reign of Alexander the Great; 7:19. R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'kindred'); 18:2, 24, R.V., 'by race' (A.V., 'born'); 2 Corinthians 11:26, 'countrymen;' Galatians 1:14, R.V., 'countrymen' (A.V., 'nation'); Philippians 3:5, 'stock;' 1 Peter 2:9 R.V., 'race' (A.V., 'generation'); (d) a kind sort, class, Matthew 13:36, 'kind;' in some mss. In q7;21, A.V., 'kind;' Mark 9:29, 'kind,' 1

Corinthians 12:10, 28 'kinds' (A.V. 'Diversities'); 14:10 (ditto) ..." With this kind of a foundation to work from, one should be able to find hundreds of passages on race. Jack Mohr could not be more mistaken in his assertions on these Hebrew and Greek words. Now, who is really the one doing the "assuming" and being "intellectually dishonest?"

We should take note that Jeffrey A. Weakly highly recommends Jack Mohr for his expertise concerning the so-called fallacy of the subject of the Seedline doctrine. That is what he said in his "The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History," on page 29: "There are other arguments but the ones addressed here are the major ones that I have encountered. If you have encountered an argument and you are sincerely seeking an answer, I suggest that first you completely study it out in God's Word (look up definitions, check parallel passages, be sure of context, etc.) After that, I suggest you contact men such as Pete Peters, Dan Gentry, Earl Jones, Jack Mohr, etc. ..." We guess the old saying is still true: birds of a feather do flock together!

Confusion Concerning Trees

On page 6 of the booklet "Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?" Jack Mohr continues to lambaste James E. Wise. As we will see, his criticism of what Wise was saying is totally unwarranted. This is what Jack Mohr says in his supposed conjecture: "Wise then goes on to make some very positive statements, which I do not believe he can back with Scripture. At least he doesn't do it here. He says: 'Therefore (because of the explanation he has given), that which is spoken of or called the 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil,' was the devil. In other places he is called the devil, Belial, etc.' But there is no Scripture which will back up his contention, no matter how much you want to believe there is. The idea that Satan or the devil was the seducer of Eve in the garden, may fit in with your theological concept, but it's not what the Word says.

“The author then mentions other trees in the garden when he says: ‘In Genesis 2:9, God first mentions the stationary trees, pecan, peach, apricot, etc.’ For the life of me, I can’t find any of these trees listed anywhere in the Bible. The apple tree is listed, but no pecan, apricot or peach. If he’s imagining these trees in the Garden, maybe he [sic. He’s] imagining when he says Satan was there too. If a man will add words which aren’t there, in order to ‘sell his point,’ he’s not to be trusted in his explanation. This man is ‘intellectually dishonest,’ and willing to twist Scripture to make it say what he wants it to.

“He then goes on to the ‘tree of life.’ He indicates that these ‘trees’ were personalities of some kind or other, although the Bible says they were trees in the original language that is what they were. No chance to make them anything other than trees.” Well Jack Mohr has evidently not read Ezekiel 31 for it demonstrates very clearly that not all the trees in the Garden of Eden was a tree like we think of one, wooden and does not move, but were actually people.

Please turn with us to the book of Ezekiel; to chapter 31 where we read:
"And it came to pass...that the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, speak unto Pharaoh king of Egypt, and to his multitude; Whom art thou like in thy greatness? Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar (a tree) in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs. The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees (people) of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees (people) of the field, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth. All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations (countries). Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches; for his foot was by great waters. (Now we change and go to the Garden of Eden) The cedars (people) in the

Garden of God could not hide him: the fir trees (people) were not like his boughs (See the comparison, thus we know that there were other people there to compare with him), and the chestnut trees (their children - or people) were not like his branches (his children - or people); Nor any tree in the Garden of God was like unto him in his beauty (See we know the trees in the Garden were people because they were not like the Assyrian in beauty - because they were of a different color, they were not White. That is not racist it is simply a fact, even if you don't like it. For God has never cared what we like or don't like when He speaks, we either accept it or reject it to our hurt). I have made him fair (White) by the multitude of his branches: so that all the trees (people) of Eden; that were in the Garden of God, envied him (trees cannot envy each other, only people can do that). Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because thou hast lifted up thyself in height, and he hath shot up his top among the thick boughs, and his heart (trees do not have hearts) lifted up in his height; I have therefore delivered him (Now God is speaking of Adam) into the hand of the mighty one of the heathen: he shall surely deal with him: I have driven him out (Driven Adam out of the Garden of Eden, because of his disobedience to Almighty God) for his wickedness. And strangers (people of other races), the terrible of the nations, have cut him off and have left him: upon the mountains and in all the valleys his branches (See he is again comparing him with a tree) are fallen by all the rivers of the land; and all the people of the earth are gone down from his shadow, and have left him (Here is were the departing of the various races left the Garden of God - The Garden of Eden and were scattered all across the earth, away from Adam and his people. Thus God segregated the races from each other, so they could not mix; which is against God's Law of Kind after Kind). Upon his ruin shall all the fowls of the heaven remain, and all the beasts of the field shall be upon his branches (Here God is saying that Adam's children would always be attracted to the black race - The Beast of the Earth); To the end that none of all the trees by the waters exalt themselves for their height, neither shoot up their top among the thick boughs, neither their trees stand up in their height, all that drink water: for they are all delivered unto death (All mankind will die because of Adam's sin), to the nether parts of the earth (In

other words all people everywhere, no matter what race would die in their time), in the midst of the children of men, with them that go down to the pit (grave). Thus saith the Lord God; In the day when he (Adam) went down to the grave (pit) I caused a mourning: I covered the deep for him, and I restrained the floods thereof, and the great waters were stayed: and I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees (people) of the field fainted (Here again trees do not faint, only people do that) for him. I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall (When Adam fell all the various races and nations on earth knew of his fall and shook with fear and sadness), when I cast him down to hell (the grave) with them that descend into the pit; and all the trees of Eden (people), the choice and best of Lebanon, all that drink water, shall be comforted (Here again trees cannot be comforted) in the neither parts of the earth. They also went down into hell (the grave) with him unto them that be slain with the sword (In other words everyone will die and go to the grave); and they that were his arm, that dwelt under his shadow in the midst of the heathen (Here we are told that the trees of the Garden were people of other races, other than Adam who was a White Man, like it or not, love it or not). To whom art thou thus like in glory and in greatness among the trees (people) of Eden? yet shalt thou be brought down with the trees (people) of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth; thou shalt lie in the midst of the uncircumcised with them that be slain by the sword. (Now God goes back to Pharaoh whom He is comparing Adam and the Assyrians with) This is Pharaoh and all his multitude, saith the Lord God." (Ezekiel 31)

Jack Mohr in the little booklet called our Messiah, our Redeemer, our Savior a wooden tree. Who else but our Savior is the "Tree of Life?" How else do we eat of Him but by taking Communion? How much more blasphemous a remark can there be made than this? Jack Mohr is totally inaccurate when he claims the pecan, peach and apricot trees are not mentioned in Scripture. He just didn't look for it. these trees are included in Genesis 1:29 when it says: "And Yahweh said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat."

Jack Mohr is making an insinuation that this couldn't include a pecan, peach or apricot tree which have seeds. He is not only blasphemous but totally unskilled in Yahweh's word, or at least it appears so to us. Yet, inasmuch as all the trees "bearing seed" were permitted by Yahweh to be eaten as food in Genesis 1:29, the trees of Genesis 3 couldn't have been fruit trees. Why would Yahweh allow the fruit of trees of Genesis 1:29 to be eaten and then turn around and go back on His own Word and make it unlawful to eat of one of them in Genesis 3? Talk about something that "don't make any sense," as he has said himself several times in the booklet. There simply is no better argument, that the trees of Genesis 3 were not wooden tree, than this passage. As he said himself: "God is not the author of confusion."

We wonder how Jack Mohr would have interpreted Mark 8:22-24 which says: "And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. And he took the blind man by the hand and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw aught. And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees walking."

This brings up an interesting question, if the man had been blind from birth, then how would he know what a tree looked like to enable him to describe men as trees walking? It is obvious that the man was not blind in the sense that he could not see anything with his eyes, but that he was blind to the Word of God, and could not understand what they were relating to him. When Christ opened his eyes he was able to see a little, but then he could see fully what was being given him.

Oddly enough, the word tree in this passage also means a solid wooden tree. Let's now check Strong's, Thayer and Zodhiates to see what they have to say about the Greek word #1186; Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible: "#1186 .. Dendron from drus (an oak); a tree: tree."

Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, page 128: “#1186 ... to grow to the shape and size of a tree.”

The “Complete Word Dictionary, New Testament,” by Spiros Zodhiates, TH.D.: “#1186... dendron...neut. Noun. A Tree...‘to become a tree’ (a.t.) Means become like a tree in size (cf. Mark 4:32). ‘I see men as trees’ means not distinctly, in an unusual size.”

Question: When was the last time you saw a solid oak tree, just down the street, about 175 feet high with a trunk 5 feet in diameter, pull up its roots and start walking? It is obvious the Bible is using figurative language many times when it speaks of “trees.” Hence the answer to Lt. Col. Jack Mohr’s question on his thesis, “Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?” It would appear that Jack Mohr again makes a mistake and argues thusly about the word “tree” in Genesis 3:17: “While Eve had been warned by God not to eat of the ‘tree of knowledge of good and evil,’ He had said nothing to her, which is recorded, about ‘touching it.’ (See Genesis 3:17) Eve was the one who added the ‘touching business,’ when she talked with the serpent. Like so many of our people, she thought she had to add to the Word. The author (James E. Wise) then goes on to ‘surmise,’ since he has no Scriptural proof, that the ‘trees,’ in the Garden were not made up of ‘sap, bark, and foliage.’ In other words, these trees were not really trees, since trees cannot ‘discern between good and evil.’ Yet nothing written in this Scripture indicates that these ‘trees,’ what ever they may have been, were supposed to do any discerning. The word TREE as used in this passage come from the Hebrew word ‘ets,’ #6095 and means ‘a tree for firmness; hence wood; gallows; helve; stock; timber; tree; wood.’ Absolutely no indications here that it refers to a ‘person,’ or ‘being’ of any kind, such as a ‘serpent’ or ‘Satan.’ He goes on to compound his strange explanation by stating that these ‘trees’ were endowed with the gift of speech. Show me anywhere the Scriptures so states.”

What is noticeable here is that Mohr says the word for “trees,” in Genesis 3:17 is #6095. It is not, however, it is #6086. It is from #6095, but it is not #6095.

The Hebrew word #6095 is atsah, not ets. Actually, what Mohr does here is to correctly apply ets, but then goes on to use Strong's definition for atsah. Quite a deceptive maneuver, or quite a mistake, we would say. Anything to make his point. There can be quite a difference between #6086 and #6095. This is what "Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies," has to say about the word "tree" on page 453 (In this case, the Hebrew characters are identical to Strong's #6086): "...a tree; often collective, trees: Genesis 1:11 & c. Figuratively, trees represent men, green trees the righteous, dry trees the wicked, Ezekiel 20:47; 17:24, all the trees of the field, all men, the high tree the lofty and powerful, the low tree the weak and contemptible..."

From this definition by Wilson we can clearly see the Hebrew word #6086, ets, as used in Genesis 3:17 can be used both literally and figuratively. Mohr's argument that it can only mean a literal "tree" is completely flawed. This goes for all the other anti-seedliners who use this point of contention to establish a false premise. When one considers how dangerous it is, to life and limb, to present the Two seedline message, it is quite inconsiderate of the anti-seedliners to harass the messenger in his duty to his Maker and His Kingdom. By doing this, the anti-seedliners are actually aiding and abetting the enemy in this time of war. It's tantamount to defecting over to the enemy's side when millions of lives of our brethren are at stake. Such false teaching is more damaging, in effect, than the evil, Satanic enemy can bring about.

We have an enemy. It's unpleasant enough that we must live under the political, religious and monetary system of the enemy, but it is intolerable, while all this is happening, to have distracting, booing, detractors on the sidelines proclaiming there is no enemy; that somehow they, the "Jews," (Revelation 2:9, 3:9) are simply ordinary people who happened to go bad. We don't know how those gainsaying disputants discount the fact that they and their continued lineage, remain corrupt generation after generation, for thousands of years. It is quite obvious that the "Jews" have retained an inbred, genetic trait which is built into their very being, clearly inherited from their ancestors. Thus, there are two genetic peoples at WAR with each other, according to the declaration of Genesis 3:15, and this WAR will not terminate

until one side or the other is completely destroyed. At the moment, our side is speedily going down to defeat.

Evidently, the anti-seedliners have never read Josephus, Wars 2:8:2.

Josephus makes it quite clear that the Pharisees and Sadducees were essentially non-Israelites by birth. Let's read this passage: "For there are three philosophical sects among the Judeans. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essens. The last are Judah by birth, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have."

It would appear that of these three sects mentioned, only the Essenes could claim to be pure blooded Israelites; that many, perhaps a majority of the Pharisees and Sadducees, were neither true Israelites, nor, of the true Tribe of Judah. Why didn't Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Judah by birth? We know that in John 8:33 & 37, it is apparent from that rendition, that the scribes and Pharisees could possibly be true Israelites.

Sure, the Arabs can claim Abraham as their father. We know, also, that the "Jews" of Messiah's day had absorbed Edomite blood, and therefore could claim both Abraham and Isaac as their fathers. The Shelanite-Judahites could even claim an affinity with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah, yet that doesn't make them of the true Tribe of Judah. For evidence that the "Jews" are not who they claim to be, we will now quote from the "A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica," by John Lightfoot, volume 2, pages 7-9: "... Common persons, as to the priesthood: such whose fathers, indeed were sprung from priests, but their mothers unfit to be admitted to the priest's marriage-bed ... such as were born in wedlock; but that which was unlawful...bastards: such as came of a certain mother, but of an uncertain father...Such as were gathered up out of the streets, whose fathers and mothers were uncertain. (See Ezra: Chapters 9 & 10)

"A defiled generation (race) indeed! And, therefore, brought up out of Babylon in this common sink, according to the opinion of the Hebrews, that the whole Jewish seed still remaining there might not be polluted by it ... Therefore he

brought them to Jerusalem, and where care might be taken by the Sanhedrim [Sanhedrin] fixed there, that the legitimate might not marry with the illegitimate... “How great a care ought there to be in the families of the pure blood, to preserve themselves untouched and clean from this impure sink; and to lay up among themselves genealogical scrolls from generation to generation as faithful witnesses and lasting monuments of their legitimate stock and free blood.

“Hear a complaint and a story in his case: ‘R. Jochanan said, By the Temple, it is in our hand to discover who are not of pure blood in the land of Israel: but what shall I do, when the chief men of this generation lie hid? (That is, when they are not of pure blood, and yet we must not declare so much openly concerning them) ‘He was of the same opinion with R. Isaac, who said...A family (of the polluted blood) that lies hid, let it lie hid. Abai also saith, We have learned this also by tradition, That there was a certain family called the family of Beth-zeriphua beyond Jordan, and a son of Zion removed it away.’ (The Goss is, Some eminent man, by a public proclamation, declared it impure) ‘But he caused another which was such’ (that is, impure) ‘to come near. And there was another which the wise men would not manifest.’

“...When it especially lay upon the Sanhedrim (Sanhedrin), settled at Jerusalem to preserve pure families, as much as in them lay, pure still; and when they prescribed canons of preserving the legitimation of the people (which you ay see in those things that follow at the place alleged), there was some necessity to lay up public records of pedigrees with them: whence it might be known what family was pure, and what defiled. Hence that of Simon Ben Azzai deserves our notice: ‘I say (saith he) a genealogical scroll in Jerusalem, in which it was thus written; ‘N., a bastard of a strange wife.’ Observe, that even a bastard was written in their books of genealogy, that he might be known to be a bastard, and that the purer families mighty take heed of the defilement of the seed...”

It should be obvious from this that the Judeans which returned from the Babylonian captivity up until the time of the Messiah were not keeping their family genetics pure. Can you now see how far off the mark Ted R. Weiland

was in his book “Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She?” when he erroneously tried to prove that the scribes and Pharisees were true Israelites by making the following statements?

Page 68: “Seedliners claim that because the Pharisees and their progenitors were charged with the murders of all the righteous from Abel to Zacharias, they cannot be Israelites but instead must be Cainites of the seed of Satan. The truth is that because the Pharisees and their forefathers were indicated for the murder of the righteous martyrs, they cannot be Cainites but instead must be Israelites.”

Page 94: “The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were Cainites of the seedline of Satan, whereas Matthew 3:7-8; 27:6-10; John 7:19; 8:28-37; Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were Judahites of the seed line of Jacob/Israel.”

While Ted R. Weiland is off the mark, he is not entirely wrong. However, his error is serious to the point of disaster. To clear up the matter, we will refer again to the “A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica,” by John Lightfoot, volume 2, page 78: “There was indeed, a certain remnant among them to be gathered by Christ: and when that gathered, the rest of the nation was delivered over to everlasting perdition. This is...that remnant of the apostle, Romans 11:5, which then was, when he writ those things; which then was to be gathered, before the destruction of that nation.” We are sure that Messiah was NOT gathering an accumulation of bastards, which the Pharisees and Sadducees for the most part were. The anti-seedliners really have a problem with Genesis 3:15 & 4:1, for if Cain was the son of Adam, there wouldn’t have been any difference between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman. If such a thing were true, which it isn’t, we might as well invite the descendants of Cain into our churches and Identity meetings. Recently, John Hagee had about ten “Jewish” professors and advisors. “Insight On The Scriptures,” volume 2, pages 887 & 889, says this about the serpent’s seed: “... Jesus identified the Jewish religious leaders

of his day as a part of the Serpent's seed, saying to them: 'Serpents, offspring [Gr., gen-ne'ma-ta, generated ones'] of vipers, how are you to flee from the judgement of Gehenna? Matthew 23:33, Int."..."enmity between the two seeds. The great serpent Satan the Devil has produced 'seed' that has manifested the bitterest enmity toward those who have served God with faith like Abraham, as the Bible record abundantly testifies. Satan has tried to block or hinder the development of the woman's seed, (Compare Matthew 13:24-30)."

This is what John Lightfoot has to say about Matthew 3:7 where John the Baptist called the Pharisees and Sadducees "vipers," in his "A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica," volume 2, pages 77-78: "Not so much 'the seed of Abraham,' which ye boast of, as 'the seed of the serpent'...A nation and offspring diametrically opposite, and an enemy to that seed of the woman, and **WHICH WAS TO BRUISE HIS HEEL**...Hence, not without round, it is concluded that that nation was rejected and given over to a reprobate sense, **EVEN BEFORE THE COMING OF CHRIST.**

"They were not only...a generation (race), but...an offspring of vipers , serpents sprung from serpents. Nor is it a wonder that they were rejected by God, when they had long since rejected God, and God's word, by their traditions...There was, in deed a certain remnant among them to be gathered by Christ: and when that was gathered, the rest of the nation was delivered over to everlasting perdition ..."

Again on page 83 of the same book, John Lightfoot says the following:

"The war proclaimed of old in Eden between the serpent, and the seed of the serpent, and the seed of the woman, Genesis 3:15, now takes place; when that promised seed of the woman comes forth into the field (being initiated by baptism, and anointed by the Holy Ghost, unto the public office of his ministry) to fight with the old serpent, and at last to bruise his head. And, since the devil was always a most imprudent spirit, now he takes upon him a more hardened boldness than ever, even of waging war with him whom he knew to be the

Son of God, because from that ancient proclamation of this war he knew well enough that he should bruise his heel."

In Matthew 3:7; 12:34 and 23:33 both John the Baptist and Yahshua called the Pharisees and Sadducees "a generation (race) of vipers," and in Matthew 12:39 Yahshua spoke of them as "an evil and adulterous (bastard) generation (race)" (adulterous meaning mixed ... impure, bastards). The following are remarks from some various commentaries:

"Adam Clarke's," abridged by Earle, page 770: "An evil and adulterous generation. Or 'race of people.' Our Lord terms the Jews an adulterous race."

"Adam Clarke's," abridged by Earle, page 770: "O generation of vipers. A terribly expressive speech. A serpentine brood, from a serpentine stock. As their fathers were, so were they, children of the wicked one."

"Matthew Henry's," vol. 5, page 24: "The title he gives them is, O generation of vipers. Christ gave them the same title; Matthew 12:34; 23:33. They were as vipers; though specious yet venomous and poisonous, and full of malice and enmity to everything that was good; they were a viperous brood, the seed and offspring of such as had been of the same spirit; it was bred in the bone with them.

They gloried in it, that they were the seed of Abraham; but John showed them that they were the serpent's seed (Compare Genesis 3:15); of their father the devil, (John 8:44). They were a viperous gang, they were all alike; though enemies to one another, yet confederate in mischief. Note: A wicked generation is a generation of vipers, and they ought to be told so ..."

"Matthew Henry's," vol. 5, page 175: "He condemns the demand, as the language of an evil and adulterous generation, v. 39. He fastens the charge, not only on the scribes and pharisees, but the whole nation of the Jews; they were all like their leaders, a seed and succession of evil doers: they were an evil generation indeed, that not only hardened themselves against the

conviction of Christ's miracles, but set themselves to abuse him, and put contempt on his miracles. They were an adulterous generation ... As an adulterous brood; so miserably degenerated ... that Abraham and Israel acknowledged them not."

"Matthew Henry's," vol. 5, page 174: "They were a generation of vipers: John [the] Baptist had called them so (Matthew 3:7), and they were still the same; for can the Ethiopian change his skin? The people looked upon the Pharisees as a generation of saints, but Christ calls them a generation of vipers, the seed of the serpent, that had an enmity to Christ and his gospel. Now what would be expected from a generation of vipers, but that which is poisonous and malignant? Can the viper be otherwise than venomous?"

"Jewish" Proselytizing

This is another aspect which should be delved into concerning the cursed "Jewish" nation at the time of the Messiah. Without this understanding, it is difficult to comprehend the conditions surrounding the "Jewish" nation at that period. Once that view is understood and grasped, a very different view will be perceived. This is a topic which has NOT been addressed, at any length, by the clergy of nominal churchianity or, for that matter among those who understand the Israel Identity message. It is paramount that we understand the complexities of that period, for if we don't, we simply cannot fathom the elements which were coming into play during that time. Once we comprehend this, we will not be prone to make ludicrous statements such as those which some of the preachers have spewed (vomited) out. (Proverbs 26:11; 23:8; 2 Peter 2:22)

We will first introduce the general story and then present the documentation. First, let's consider the Scripture where Messiah condemned the "Jews" for their proselytizing, Matthew 23:15: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves."

In Matthew Chapter 3, we are told of John the Baptist and his endeavor to prepare the way for the Messiah by conversion and baptizing. It seems here, according to the story, the Pharisees and Sadducees came and inquired of John what he was doing. Forthrightly, John informed the “Jews,” he didn’t baptize “vipers.”

Why were the Pharisees and Sadducees so interested in what John the Baptist was doing? Many may be unaware of the fact that the Pharisees and Sadducees were also baptizing their converts. The requirement to become a “Jewish” proselyte was firstly, to be circumcised, and when the wound was healed, then secondly, the candidate was baptized. The “Jews” considered that when their candidate went down into the water he was a heathen, and when he came back up, he was an Israelite. This is fantastic, for a non-Israelite could be baptized thousands of times and it would not make him an Israelite. And of just whom were these “jews” baptizing and making proselytes? Many were the of the seven Canaanite nations. Now some excerpts from pages 55 to 63 from “A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica,” volume 2, by John Lightfoot: “Whensoever any heathen will betake himself, and be joined to the covenant of Israel, and place himself under the wings of the divine Majesty, and take the yoke of the law upon him, voluntary circumcision, baptism, and oblation, are required...That was a common axiom...No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized...[because none becomes a proselyte without circumcision and baptism] of the Sanhedrim ... If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters are made proselytes also, that which is done by their father redounds to their good...A heathen women, if she is made a proselytess, when she is now big with child, the child needs not baptism...for the baptism of his mother serves for him for baptism...‘If an Israelite take a Gentile child...or find a Gentile infant, and baptizeth him in the name of a proselyte; behold, he is a proselyte’...First, You see baptism inseparably joined to the circumcision of proselytes. There was, indeed some little distance of time; for ‘they were not baptized till the pain of circumcision was healed, because

water might be injurious to the wound.’ but certainly baptism ever followed... Secondly, Observing from these things which have been spoken, how very known and frequent that use of baptism was among the Jews, the reason appears very easy why the Sanhedrim, by their messengers, inquired not of John concerning the reason of baptism, but concerning the authority of the baptizer; not what baptism meant, but whence he had a license so to baptize, John 1:25...For the admission of a proselyte was reckoned no light matter...Proselytes are dangerous to Israel, like the itch...When a proselyte was to be circumcised, they first asked him concerning the sincerity of his conversion to Judaism: whether he offered not himself to proselytism for the obtaining of riches, for fear, or for love to some Israelite woman...As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to baptism; and being laced in the water, they again instruct him in some weightier and in some lighter commands of the law. Which being heard...he plunges himself, and comes up, and behold, he is as an Israelite in all things...“...but a proselyte was baptized not only into the washing-off of that Gentile pollution, nor only thereby to be transplanted into the religion of the Jews; but that, by the most accurate rite of translation that could possibly be, he might so pass into an Israelite, that, being married to an Israelite woman, he might produce a free and legitimate seed, and an undefiled offspring. Hence, servants that were taken into a family were baptized; and servants also that were to be made free: not so much because they were defiled with heathen uncleanness, as that, by that rite...becoming Israelites in all respects, they might be more fit to match [mate] with Israelites, and their children be accounted as Israelites. And hence the sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised indeed, but not baptized. They were circumcised, that they might take upon themselves the obligation of the law; but they needed not baptism, because they were already Israelites. [Bull manure!]...The baptism of proselytes was the bringing over of Gentiles into the Jewish relation...”

You can see from this, things at that period were not at all like we are led to believe. The people of that “Jewish” nation had so corrupted themselves genetically, there were hardly any pureblooded Israelites left among them.

Here you have the facts laid out before you, so that it will save you a lot of homework on your part. All you have to do is verify them. It would appear the time has come for some who follow the teachings of anti-seedliners to wake up and get the wax out of their ears. Here is substantial evidence the anti-seedliners are not as informed as they should be. Not only are the Judeo-Christian clergy of today blind to the conditions of that nation, but we have those in Israel Identity who have been trained in the Judeo-churchianity theological centers who aren't much better.

It takes a lot of time and effort, sweat and blood, to put research like this together. Furthermore, if one cannot see the parallel between what is going on today, with all of the mixed-racial marriages, just as the Judeans of that day were taking strange wives and strange husbands, one has to be blind. They were taking others in marriage who were often descended from the seven Canaanite nations. There were some pureblooded Benjamites who were still in Galilee, from whom Yahshua took all of His disciples except one, as there were some Essenes in Judea.

The anti-seedliners seem to completely overlook the commission of the Messiah in 1 John 3:8, that of destroying the works of Satan: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneht from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of god was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

By coming when He did, Yahshua was there in the midst of the genetic descendants of Satan, through Cain, who were quite aptly called "vipers." Messiah Himself called them "vipers," as did John the Baptist. Thus, Messiah was in the realm of the geographic seat where the devils lived. If the devil's headquarters had been anywhere else in the world, He would have been there.

If He was going to destroy the devil's works, He had to be where the devils thrived, which He was. If you will check the next verse (v.0), you will notice

that whether one is a genetic son of the devil, or, a genetic son of Yahweh, depends on the sperm, or “seed.” It speaks of the children of Yahweh, saying “his sperma remaineth in him.” However, the anti-seedliners insist that “sperma” is spiritual. Let’s look at “Matthew Henry’s Commentary,” which says this on this passage, vol. 6, pages 1076-1077: “From the discrimination between the children of God and the children of the devil. They have their distinct characters. In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil, v. 10. In the world (according to the old distinction) there are the seed [sperma] of God and seed [sperma] of the serpent.” ...”... and he belongs to the party, and interest, kingdom of the devil. It is he that is the author and patron of sin, and has been a practitioner of it, a tempter and instigator of it, even from the beginning of the world.” ... “The devil has designed and endeavored to ruin the work of God in his world. The son of God has undertaken the holy war against him.” ... “It showed that he was the firstborn of the serpent’s seed [sperma]; even he, the eldest son [Cain] ...was of the wicked one. He imitated and resembled the first wicked one, the devil.”

“A Commentary On the Holy Bible,” by Matthew Poole, vol. 3, pages 935-936 comments thusly: “And such a sinner, he says is of the devil; as if he were born of him, where his child, really conformed to him, and having his sinning nature ... Upon what was said, he reduces all men each to their own family and father, concluding it manifest whither they belonged; i.e., he shows, upon the grounds before expressed, who do not belong to God and his family, leaving it thence to be collected, since two fathers and families divide the world, to which they must be reckoned; i.e., they belong not to God, and consequently to that worst of fathers, who first, in general, do not righteousness; the devil being the first sinner, they are his descendants ... Which showed him to be of that wicked one, of the serpent’s seed: so early was such seed sown, and so ancient the enmity between seed and seed.”

The matter of the Two Seedlines is of the utmost importance in our day, for we are beginning to see the culmination of this age-old “enmity” coming to a head. While it has been lying festering just below the surface for several thousands of years, today it is reaching its peak. It’s like a giant abscess getting ready to erupt and spill out all its foul, infectious, corrupt, putrefying

poison. And, while these great evil underground forces are at work, the Judeo-Christian churchianity sits idly on the sidelines pretending all is well. In fact, the infection from this giant abscess is sweeping into their midst, and they consider it “Christian.” As if this were not bad enough, the anti-seedliners disavow the cause of the infection. To the anti-seedliners, it’s just a theological game of words. They simply haven’t done their homework on the subject. To show you this, we will not quote excerpts from Dr. Lightfoot in his “A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica,” volume 2, pages 367-369 concerning Matthew 27:38-46: “Among the monsters of the Jewish routs, preceding the destruction of the city, the multitude of robbers, and the horrible slaughters committed by them, deservedly claim the first consideration; which, next to the just vengeance of God against that most wicked nation, you may justly ascribe to divers originals.

1). It is no wonder, if that nation abounded beyond measure with a vagabond, dissolute, and lewd sort of young men; since, by means of polygamy, and the divorces of their wives at pleasure and the nation’s unspeakable addictedness to lasciviousness and whoredoms, there could not but continually spring up bastards, and an offspring born only to beggary or rapine, as wanting both sustenance and ingenuous education.

2) The foolish and sinful indulgence of the council could not but nurse up all kind of broods of wicked men, while they scarce ever put any one to death, though never so wicked, as being a Jew; who must not by any means be touched...the power of darkness, Luke 22:53.

God who had foretold of old, that the serpent should bruise the heel of the promised seed, and now that time is come, had slackened the devil’s chain, which, in regard of men, the Divine Providence used to hold in his hand; so that all the power and all the rancor of hell might, freely and without restraint, assault Christ; and that all that malice that was in the devil against the whole

elect of God, [would be] summed up and gathered together into one head, might at one stroke and onset be brandished against Christ without measure.” If you listen to the anti-seedliners, they will claim there was “no power of hell” at work in the Crucifixion of the Messiah. They delegate all of that to some kind of “spiritual” hocus-pocus, making mockery of the foundational tenets of Scripture.

“Yahshua’s Heel Bruised by Judas!!!”

We have a direct connection, here, with Judas, and the “serpent,” if we read John 13:18: “I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eatheth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.”

The scripture spoken of here, which was fulfilled in Judas, the Jew, was Genesis 3:15! Does that sound ‘spiritual’? Judas was a Kenite-Canaanite “Jew-devil,” a descendant of Cain fathered by Satan! However, there is a problem here because it says that “he (Judas, the Jew) hath lifted up his heel against me” whereas Genesis 3:15 says, that “thou (the seed of the serpent) shall bruise his (Yahshua’s) heel.” Is it the “heel” of Judas or Yahshua that is affected? We are quite certain that John 13:18 is referring to Genesis 3:15, as it is indicating that it is a fulfillment of Scripture. Tell us, what other Scripture could it be? There isn’t any.

There is another Scripture, Psalm 41:9, that reads similarly to John 13:18, but John 13:18 is not a fulfillment of Psalm 41:9; as a matter of fact, Psalm 41:9 is not a prophecy about anything. The prophecy then can only be Genesis 3:15! And Genesis 3:15 is definitely a prophecy. Therefore, there has to be a slight mistranslation in Genesis 3:15! Let’s try to render it in a manner which makes some sense: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (her seed) shall bruise thy heel and thy heel shall (rise up and) bruise him (her seed).”

Its not the seed of the serpent that was to bruise the heel of Yahshua, but the seed of the serpent will lift up his heel and bruise Yahshua (the seed of the woman). Now, Yahshua is not the only seed of the woman. All of Eve's descendants are the seed of the woman. Once we understand that it is the seed of the serpent (in the person of Judas) that was to lift up his heel against the messiah, we can better understand Isaiah 53:5: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

On good comment on John 13:18, is from the "Jamieson, Fausset & Brown "Commentary On The Whole Bible," page 1058: "I speak not of you all; the 'happy are ye,' of vs. 17, being on no supposition applicable to Judas. I know whom I have chosen; in the higher sense. But that the scripture may be fulfilled, i.e., one has been added to your number, by no accident or mistake, who is none of Mine, but just that he might fulfill his predicted destiny. He that eateth bread with me; 'did eat of my bread.'

"It was Judas that raised up his heel against Him and bruised Him. It probably should be pointed out here what is meant by 'lifting up the heel.' It is described as someone who kicks out at the person who is feeding him. Judas, planning to betray Yahshua while eating of the sacrificial supper, did just that, and it is known as 'lifting up the heel.' This 'heel' in John 13:18 is the same 'heel' as in Genesis 3:15. This type of action was considered one of the most insulting things a man could do. Of course, what else would you expect of the devil?

"Just before this 'lifting up the heel' on the part of Judas by partaking of the last supper, some interesting statements are made. They were having a foot washing lesson from Yahshua. Verse 10 say, 'Yahshua saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean (pure) every white: and y are clean (pure), but not all.' Yahshua is indicating that all the disciples are clean (pure) racially, but no amount of washing would make Judas clean (pure).

“A second statement in this 18th verse is also interesting it says, ‘I speak not of you all.’ Again Yahshua is excluding Judas from the others. ‘I know whom I have chose.’ I am not deceived in my choice. I knew what was going to happen from the very beginning of the enmity of the serpent. I have chosen the very beginning of the enemy of the serpent. I have chosen Judas as a ‘serpent’ and I plainly foresaw that he would raise up the heel and deliver Me. Did not I foretell this at the time of the curse upon the ‘serpent?’

Matthew 26:14-16: “Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, And said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.”

If you can't see “Jew” written all over this action on the part of this “serpent,” Judas, you have to be blind. For the Jews are the most traitorous people that have ever existed in all of the history of the world. Yet, Judas was only doing his father's (the devil) bidding, John 12:4-6: “Then said one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.”

Not only was this “serpent-Jew” a traitor, he was a thief; just like the “Jewish” IRS and Federal Reserve System of today. Here is more evidence that Judas was the offspring of Satan: “Like the Spirit that is within Yahweh's children (seed of the woman), so there is a counter-spirit within the ‘serpent's’ children. That is why it just came natural for Judas to betray Yahshua. It says here that the devil put it into the heart of Judas to betray the Messiah. The children of Satan have a certain nature about them, and under various circumstances, they will react in predictable behavior patterns. The Messiah understood exactly what the behavior pattern is yet more evidence that the ‘Jews,’ are a Satanic seedline. You cannot change the nature of a rattlesnake, nor can you

change the nature of a 'Jew.' So much for 'Jews for Jesus?'" (See also Jeremiah 13:23)

All this is totally oblivious to the anti-seedliners. Speaking further on page 83 of volume 2, Lightfoot says of that nation: "That the nation, under the second Temple was given to magical arts beyond measure ... That it was given to easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure. And one may safely suspect, that those voices which they thought to be from heaven, and noted with the name Bath Kol, were either formed by the devil in the air to deceive the people, or by magicians by devilish art to promote their own affairs ... The very same which I judge of the Bath Kol, is [in] my opinion also of the frequent appearances of Elias, with which the leaves of the Talmud do every where abound; namely, that in very many places the stories are false, and, in the rest, the apparitions of him were diabolical."

The "magical arts" used by the "Jews" is called the "Cabala" (sometimes spelled Cabbala, Kabbalah or Qabbalah). According to Warren Weston in his "Father Of Lies," page 51: "The four collections of works composing the Dogmatic Kabbalah are:

- 1). The Sepher Yetzirah, or the 'Book of the Formation:' it treats of the cosmogony as symbolized by ten members and twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, which it calls the 'thirty-two paths' or symbols, with the esoteric zero making thirty-three in all ... The whole Kabbalah is usually classed under four heads: (1) The Practical Kabbalah; (2) the Literal Kabbalah; (3) the Unwritten Kabbalah; (4) the Dogmatic Kabbalah ...
- 2). The Zohar, or book of 'Splendor,' itself composed of five important books (besides other treatises) ... These five are Siphra Dtzenioutha, or 'Book of Concealed Mystery;' are: Siphra Dtzenioutha, or 'Book of concealed Mystery;' Idra Rabba Qadisha, or 'greater Holy Assembly;' Idra Zuta Qadisha, or 'Lesser Holy Assembly;' Beth Elohim, or 'House of the Elohim;' and the 'Book of the Revolutions of the soul.'

3). The Sepher Sephiroth, or 'Book of Numbers' (or Emanations) ... Sephira, 'number' (singular); Sephiroth (plural).

4). The Asch Metzareph, or 'Purifying Fire,' dealing with Alchemy."

While a good deal of the form of the Cabala can be traced to the second century, the substance appears to originate from remote antiquity, possibly as remote as Cain. In the book "trail of the Serpent," by Miss Stoddard, page 25, the Cabala is described: "The Practical or Magical Cabala with its combinations and correspondences was the astrological, magical, and magnetic basis used by the Alchemists and Magicians of the Middle Ages in working their transmutations and conjurations. It was impregnated with the 'fludic magic' derived from very ancient cults, and still practiced at the time of the captivity among the Persians and Chaldeans. Today, all Rosicrucians and Cabalistic sects use this Magical Cabala for their woks of divining, clairvoyance, hypnotic and magnetic healing, making of talismans, and contracting their mysterious masters. As the Jewish writer Bernard Lazare said: 'Secret societies represented the two sides of the Jewish mind, practical rationalism and pantheism, that pantheism which, metaphysical reflection of the belief in One god, ended at times in cabalistic theurgy.'"

The Jews Believe in More than Thirty Gods!

Now these Sephiroth, or the world of emanations, or the atzilatic world, gave birth to three worlds in the following order: From the conjunction [copulation] of the king and queen, or the Briatic world, also called the throne, which is the abode of pure spirits, and which, like its parents, consists of Ten Sephiroth, or Emanations.

The Briatic World, again, gave rise to, (2). The Word of Formation, or the Jetziratic World, which is the habitation of the angels, and also consists of ten Sephiroth; whilst the Jetziratic World, again, sent forth. (3). The World of Action, or the Assiatic World, also called the World of Keliphoth, which

contains the Spheres and matter, and is the residence of the Prince of Darkness and his legions.

Or, as the Sohar describes it: "After the Sephiroth, and for their use, God made the Throne (the world of Creation), with four legs and six steps, thus making ten (the decade of Sephiroth which each world has)...For this Throne and its service he formed the ten Angelic hosts (the World of Formation), Malachim, Arelim, Chajoth, Ophanim, Chashmalim, Elim, Elohim, Benei Elohim, Ishim, and Seraphim, and for their service, again, he made Samaël and his legions (the World of Action), who are, as it were, the clouds upon which the angels ride in their descent on the earth, and serve, as it were, for their horses. Hence it is written: 'Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt.'" ((Isa. xix, 1) (Sohar ii, 43a)) **There are, therefore, four worlds**, each of which has a separate Sephiric system, consisting of a decade of emanations.

(1). The Atzilatic World, called alternately the World of Emanations, the Image (== with prefixed), and the Heavenly Man, which, by virtue of its being a direct emanation from God and most intimately allied with the Deity, is perfect and immutable.

(2). The Briatic World, called the World of Creation and the Throne which is the immediate emanation of the former, and whose ten Sephiroth, being further removed from the En Soph, are of a more limited and circumscribed potency, through the substances they comprise are of the purest nature and without any admixture of matter.

(3). The Jetziratic World, called the World of Formation and the World of Angels, which proceeded from the former world, and whose ten Sephiroth, though of a still less refined substance than the former, because further removed from the primordial source, are still without matter. It is in this angelic world where those intelligent and incorporeal beings reside, who are wrapped in a luminous garment, and who assume a sensuous form when they appear to man. And;

(4). The Assiatic World, called the World of Action and the World of Matter which emanated from the preceding world, the ten Sephiroth of which are made up of the grosser elements of all the former three worlds, and which has sunk down in consequence of its materiality and heaviness. Its substances consist of matter limited by space and perceptible to the senses in a multiplicity of forms. It is subject to constant changes, generations, and corruptions, and is the abode of the Evil Spirit.

Before leaving this doctrine about the creation of the relationship of the Supreme Being to the universe, we must reiterate two things.

(1). Though the trinity of the Sephiroth gave birth to the universe, or, in other words, is an evolution of the emanations, and is thus a further expansion of the Deity itself, it must not be supposed that the Kabbalists believe in a Trinity in our sense of the word. Their view on this subject will best be understood from the following remark in the Sohar: "Whoso wishes to have an insight into the sacred unity, let him consider a flame rising from a burning coal or a burning lamp. He will see first a twofold light, a bright white and a black or blue light; the white light is above, and ascends in a direct light, whilst the blue or dark light is below, and seems as the chair of the former, yet both are so intimately connected together that they constitute only one flame. The seat, however, formed by the blue or dark light, is again connected with the burning matter which is under it again. The white light never changes its color, it always remains white; but various shades are observed in the lower light, whilst the lowest light, moreover, takes two directions, above it is connected with the white light, and below with the burning matter. Now this is constantly consuming itself, and perpetually ascends to the upper light, and thus everything merges into a single unity. (Sohar, i, 51a)

(2). The creation, or the universe, is simply the garment of God woven from the deity's own substance; or, as Spinoza expresses it, God is the immanent basis of the universe. For although, to reveal himself to us, the Concealed of

all the Concealed sent forth the Ten Emanations called The Form of God, Form of the Heavenly man, yet since even this luminous form was too dazzling for our vision, it had to assume another form, or had to put on another garment which consists of the universe. The universe, therefore, or The Visible World, is a further expansion of The Divine Substance, and is called The Kabbalah "The Garment of God."

Thus we are told, "when the Concealed of all the Concealed wanted to reveal himself, he first made a point [the first Sephira], shaped it into a sacred form [the totality of the Sephiroth], and covered it with a rich and splendid garment that is the world." (Sohar, i, 2a)

(3). The Creation of Angels and Men. The different worlds which successively emanated from the En Soph and from each other, and which sustain the relationship to the Deity of first, second, third, and fourth generations, are, with the exception of the first (the World of Emanations), inhabited by spiritual beings of various grades. "God animated every part of the firmament with a separate spirit, and forthwith all the heavenly hosts were before him. This is meant by the Psalmist, when he says, (Ps. xxxiii, 6) 'By the breath of his mouth were made all their hosts.'" (Sohar, iii, 68a)

These angels consist of two kinds, good and bad; they have their respective princes, and occupy the three habitable worlds in the following order. As has already been remarked, the first world, or the Archetypal Man, in whose image everything is formed, is occupied by no one else. The angel Metatron occupies the second or the Briatic World, which is the first habitable world; he alone constitutes the world of pure spirits. He is the garment of the visible manifestation of the Deity; his name is numerically equivalent to that of the Lord. (Sohar, iii, 231a)

He governs the visible world, preserves the unity, harmony, and the revolutions of all the spheres, planets and heavenly bodies, and is the Captain of the myriads of the angelic hosts who people the second habitable or the

Jetziratic World, and who are divided into ten ranks, answering to the ten Sephiroth. Each of these angels is set over a different part of the universe. One has the control of one sphere, another of another heavenly body; one angel has charge of the sun, another of the moon, another of the earth, another of the sea, another of the fire, another of the wind, another of the light, another of the seasons, etc.,; and the question, however, about the doctrine of the Trinity in other passages of the Sohar will be discussed more amply in the sequel, where we shall point out the relation of the Kabbalah to Christianity.

The Kabbalistic description of Metatron is taken from the Jewish angelology of a much older date than this theosophy. Thus Ben Asai and Ben Soma already regard the divine voice, as Metatron. (Beresh. Rab., Parsha v) He is called the Great Teacher, the Teacher of Teachers, and it is for this reason that Enoch, who walked in close communion with God, and taught mankind by his holy example, is said by the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan b. Uzziel, to 'have received the name Metatron, the Great Teacher' after he was transplanted. (Gen. v, 24) Metatron, moreover, is the Presence Angel, the Angel of the Lord that was sent to go before Israel; (Exod. xxiii, 21) he is the visible manifestation of the Deity, for in him is the name of the Lord, his name and that of the Deity are identical, inasmuch as they are of the same numerical value (viz.: and are the same according to the exegetical rule called Gematria, $10 + 4 + 300 = 314$; $50 + 6 + 200 + 9 + 9 + 40 = 314$. ((See Rashi on Exod. xxiii, 21, and Sanhedrin 38b)) So exalted is Metatron's position in the ancient Jewish angelology, that we are told that when Elisha b. Abnja, also called Acher, saw this angel who occupies the first position after the Deity, he exclaimed, 'Peradventure, but far be it, there are two supreme powers.' (Talmud, Chagiga, 15a)

The etymology is greatly disputed; but there is no doubt that it is to be derived from metator, messenger, outrider, way maker, as has been shown by Elias Levita, and is maintained by Cassel. ((Ersch und Gruber's Encyklopädie, section ii, vol. xxvii, s.v.; Juden, p. 40, note 84))

Sachs ((beiträge zur Sprachund Alterthumsforschung, vol. i, Berlin 1852, p. 108)) rightly remarks that this etymology is fixed by the passage from Siphra, (quoted in kaphter-Va-Pherach, c. x, p. 34b) the finger of God was the messenger or guide to Moses, and showed him all the land of Israel. The termination has been appended to obtain the same numerical value. The derivation of it from the angel is immediately under the divine throne, which is maintained by Frank, (Kabbala, p. 43) Graetz (Gnosticismus, p. 44) and others, has been shown by Frankel ((Zeitschrift, 1846 vol. iii, p. 113)) and Cassel, (Ersch und Gruber's Encyklop. section ii, vol. xxvii, p. 41) to be both contrary to the form of the word and to the description of Metatron.

These angels derive their names from the heavenly bodies they respectively guard. Hence one is called Venus, one Mars, one the substance of Heaven, one the angel of light, and another the angel of fire. (Comp. Sohar i, 42, etc.) The demons, constituting the second class of angels, which are the grossest and most deficient of all forms, and are the shells of being, inhabit the third habitable or Asiatic World.

They, too, form ten degrees, answering to the decade of Sephiroth, in which darkness and impurity increase with the descent of each degree. Thus the two first degrees are nothing more than the absence of all visible form and organization, which the Mosaic cosmology describes in the words before the hexahemeron, and which the Septuagint renders.

The third degree is the abode of the darkness which the book of Genesis describes as having in the beginning covered the face of the earth. Whereupon follow seven infernal halls == Hells, occupied by the demons, which are the incarnation of all human vices, and which torture those poor deluded beings who suffered themselves to be led astray in this world. These seven infernal halls are subdivided into endless compartments, as to afford a separate chamber of torture for every species of sin.

The prince of this region of darkness, who is called Satan in the Bible, is denominated by the Kabbalah, Samaël == angel of poison or of death. He is the same evil spirit, Satan, the Serpent, who seduced Eve. He has a wife, called the Harlot or the Woman of Whoredom, but they are both generally represented as united in the one name of the Beast. (Comp. Sohar, ii, 255-259, with i, 35b)

The whole universe, however, was incomplete, and did not receive its finishing stroke till man was formed, who is the acme of the creation, and the microcosm uniting in himself the totality of beings.

"The heavenly Adam (the ten Sephiroth), who emanated from the highest primordial obscurity (the En Soph), created the earthly Adam." (Sohar, ii, 70b)

"Man is both the import and the highest degree of creation, for which reason he was formed on the sixth day. As soon as man was created, everything was complete, including the upper and nether worlds, for everything is comprised in man. He unites in himself all forms." (Sohar, iii, 48a)

Man was created with faculties and features far transcending those of the angels. The bodies of the protoplasts were not of that gross matter which constitutes our bodies. Adam and Eve, before the fall, were wrapped in that luminous ethereal, substance in which the celestial spirits are clad, and which is neither subject to want nor to sensual desires.

They were envied by the angels of the highest rank. The fall, however, changed it all, as we are told in the following passage: "When Adam dwelled in the garden of Eden, he was dressed in the celestial garment, which is a garment of heavenly light. But when he was expelled from the garden of Eden, and became subject to the wants of this world, what is written? 'The Lord God made coats of skins unto Adam and to his wife, and clothed them'; (Gen. iii, 21) for prior to this they had garments of light, light of that light which was used in the garden of Eden." (Sohar, ii, 229b)

The garments of skin, therefore, mean our present body, which was given to our first parents in order to adapt them to the changes which the fall introduced. But even in the present form, the righteous are above the angels, and every man is still the microcosm, and every member of his body corresponds to a constituent part of the visible universe.

What is man? Is he simply skin, flesh, bones, and veins? No! That which constitutes the real man is the soul, and those things which are called the skin, the flesh, the bones, and the veins, all these are merely a garment, they are simply the clothes of the man, but not the man himself. When man departs, he puts off these garments wherewith the son of man is clothed. Yet are all these bones and sinews formed in the secret of the highest wisdom, after the heavenly image.

The skin represents the firmament, which extends everywhere, and covers everything like a garment, as it is written, 'Who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain.' (Psalm clv, 2) The flesh represents the deteriorated part of the world ...the bones and the veins represent the heavenly chariot, the inner powers, the servants of God...But these are the outer garments, for in the inward part is the deep mystery of the heavenly man. Everything here below, as above, is mysterious.

Therefore it is written: 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him'; (Gen. i, 27) repeating the word God twice, one for the man and the other for the woman. The mystery of the earthly man is after the mystery of the Heavenly man.

And just as we see in the firmament above, covering all things, different signs which are formed of the stars and planets, and which contain secret things and profound mysteries, studied by those who are wise and expert in these signs; so there are in the skin, which is the cover of the body of the son of man, and which is like the sky that covers all things, signs and features which are the stars and planets of the skin, indicating secret things and profound

mysteries, whereby the wise are attracted, who understand to read the mysteries in the human face." (Sohar, ii, 76a)

He is still the presence of god upon earth [this is where the humanist religion was born. That man is god!], and the very form of the body depicts the Tetragrammation, the most sacred name Jehovah.

Thus the head is the form of the arms and the shoulders are like the breast represents the Sephiroth from which it emanates, **every soul has ten potencies, which are subdivided into a trinity of triads, and respectively represented by:**

(1) The Spirit, which is the highest degree of being, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by The Crown, representing the highest triad, in the Sephiroth, called the Intellectual World;

(2) The Soul, which is the seat of good and evil, as well as the moral qualities, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Beauty, representing the second triad in the Sephiroth, called the Moral World; and

(3) The Cruder Spirit, which is immediately connected with the body, is the direct cause of its lower functions, instincts, and animal life, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Foundation, representing the third triad in the Sephiroth, called the Material World.

In its original state each soul is androgynous, and is separated into male and female when it descends on earth to be borne in a human body. We have seen that the souls of the righteous, in the world of spirits, are superior in dignity to the heavenly powers and the ministering angels. It might, therefore, be asked why do these souls leave such as abode of bliss, and come into this vale of tears to dwell in tabernacles of clay?

The only reply to be given is that these happy souls have no choice in the matter. Indeed we are told that the soul, before assuming a human body, addresses God: "Lord of the Universe! I am happy in this world, and do not wish to go into another world, where I shall be a bond-maid, and be exposed to all kinds of pollutions." (Sohar, ii, 96)

And can you wonder at this pitiful ejaculation? Should your philanthropic feelings and your convictions that our heavenly Father ordains all things for the good of his children, impel you to ask that an explanation of this mystery might graciously be vouchsafed to you in order to temper your compassion and calm your faith, then take this parable: "A son was born to a king; he sends him to the country, there to be nursed and brought up till he is grown up, and instructed in the ceremonies and usages of the royal palace. When the king hears that the education of his son is finished, what does his fatherly love impel him to do? For his son's sake he sends for the Queen his mother, conducts him into the palace and makes merry with him all day. "Thus the Holy One, blessed be he, has a son with the Queen [Here the Jews are saying it is alright for a man to make love with his own mother!]: this is the heavenly and sacred soul. He sends him into the country, that is into this world, therein to grow up and to learn the customs of the court. When the King hears that this his son has grown up in the country, and that it is time to bring him into the palace, what does his love for his son impel him to do? He sends, for his sake, for the Queen and conducts him to the palace." (Sohar, i, 215b) As has already been remarked, the human soul, before it descends into the world, is androgynous, or in other words, consists of two component parts, each of which comprises all the elements of our spiritual nature.

Thus the Sohar tells us: "Each soul and spirit, prior to its entering into this world, consists of a male and female united into one being. When it descends on this earth the two parts separate and animate two different bodies. "At the time of marriage, the Holy One, blessed be he, who knows all souls and spirits, unites them again as they were before, and they again constitute one body and one soul, forming as it were the right and left of one individual;

therefore 'There is nothing new under the sun.' (Ecl. i, 9) This union, however, is influenced by the deeds of the man and by the ways in which he walks. The soul carries her knowledge with her to the earth, so that 'everything which she learns here below she knew already, before she entered into this world.' (Sohar, iii, 61b)

Since the form of the body as well as the soul, is made after the image of the Heavenly Man, a figure of the forth-coming body which is to clothe the newly descending soul, is sent down from the celestial regions, to hover over the couch of the husband and wife when they copulate, in order that the conception may be formed according to this model. "At connubial intercourse on earth, the Holy One, blessed be he, sends a human form which bears the impress of the divine stamp. This form is present at intercourse, and if we were permitted to see it we should perceive over our heads an image resembling a human face; and it is in this image that we are formed. As long as this image is not sent by God and does not descend and hover over our heads, there can be no conception, for it is written: 'And God created man in his own image.' (Gen. i, 27)

This image receives us when we enter the world, it develops itself with us when we grow, and accompanies us when we depart this life; as it is written: 'Surely, man walked in an image': (Psalm xxxvii, 5) and this image is from heaven. When the souls are to leave their heavenly abode, each soul separately appears before the Holy King, dressed in a sublime form, with the features in which it is to appear in this world. It is from this sublime form that the image proceeds. It is the third after the soul, and precedes it on the earth; it is present at the conception, and there is no conception in the world where this image is not present." (Sohar, iii, 104a-b)

All human countenances are divisible into the four primordial types of faces, which appeared at the mysterious chariot throne in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, viz., the face of man, of the lion, the ox and the eagle. Our faces resemble these more or less according to the rank which our souls occupy in

the intellectual or moral dominion; "And physiognomy does not consist in the external lineaments, but in the features which are mysteriously drawn in us. The features in the face change according to the form which is peculiar to the inward face of the spirit. It is the spirit which produces all those physiognomical peculiarities known to the wise; and it is only through the spirit that the features have any meaning. All those spirits and souls which proceed from Eden (the highest wisdom) have a peculiar form, which is reflected in the face." (Sohar, ii, 73b)

The face thus lighted up by the peculiar spirit inhabiting the body, in the mirror of the soul; and the formation of the head indicates the character and temper of the man. An arched forehead is a sign of a cheerful and profound spirit, as well as of a distinguished intellect; a broad but flat forehead indicates foolishness and silliness; whilst a forehead which is flat, compressed on the sides and spiral, betokens narrowness of mind and vanity. (Comp. Sohar, ii, 71b, 75a)

As a necessary condition of free existence and of moral being, the souls are endowed by the Deity, from the very beginning, with the power of adhering in close proximity to the primordial source of infinite light from the very beginning, with the power of adhering in close proximity to the primordial source of infinite light from which they emanated, and of alienating themselves from that source and pursuing an independent and opposite course.

Hence, Simon ben Jochai said, "If the Holy One, blessed be he, had not put within us both the good and the evil desire, which are denominated light and darkness, the created man would have neither virtue nor vice. For this reason it is written: 'Behold, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.' (Deut. xxx, 15) To this the disciples replied, Wherefore is all this? Would it not be better if reward and punishment had not existed at all, since in that case man would have been incapable of sinning and of doing evil. He rejoined, It was meet and right that he should be created as he was created,

because the Law was created for him, wherein are written punishments for the wicked and rewards for the righteous; and there would not have been any reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked but for created man." (Sohar i, 23a)

So complete is their independence, that souls, even in their pre-existent state, can and do choose which way they intend to pursue.

"All souls which are not guiltless in this world, have already alienated themselves in heaven from the Holy One, blessed be he; they have thrown themselves into an abyss at their very existence, and have anticipated the time when they are to descend on earth...Thus were the souls before they came into this world." (Sohar, iii, 61b)

(4). The Destiny of Man and the Universe. As the En Soph constituted man the microcosm, and as the Deity is reflected in this epitome of the universe more than in any component part of the creation, all things visible and invisible are designed to aid him in passing through his probationary state here below, in gathering that experience for which his soul has been sent down, and in returning in a pure state to that source of light from which his soul emanated.

This destiny of man, the reunion with the Deity from which he emanated, is the constant desire both of God and man, and is an essential principle of the soul, underlying its very essence. Discarding that blind power from our nature, which governs our animal life [This is where Darwin got the idea for the origin of the species], which never quits this earth, and which therefore plays no part in our spiritual being, the soul possesses two kinds of powers and two sorts of feelings.

It has the faculty for that extraordinary prophetic knowledge, which was vouchsafed to Moses in an exceptional manner, called the Luminous Mirror (speculator), and the ordinary knowledge termed the Non-Luminous Mirror,

respectively represented in the earthly Paradise by the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil; and it possesses the higher feeling of love and the lower feeling of fear. Now the full fruition of that higher knowledge and of that loftier feeling of love can only be reaped when the soul returns to the Infinite Source of Light, and is wrapped in that luminous garment which the protoplasts forfeited throughout the fall.

Thus we are told, "Come and see when the soul reaches that place which is called the Treasury of Life, she enjoys a bright and luminous mirror, which receives its light from the highest heaven. The soul could not bear this light but for the luminous mantle which she put on. For just as the soul, when sent to this earth, puts on an earthly garment to preserve herself here, so she receives above a shining garment, in order to be able to look without injury into the mirror whose light proceeds from the Lord of Light. Moses too could not approach to look into that higher light which he saw, without putting on such an ethereal garment: as it is written: 'And Moses went into the midst of the cloud.', (Exod. xxiv, 18) which is to be translated by means of the cloud wherewith he wrapped himself as if dressed in a garment. At that time Moses almost discarded the whole of his earthly nature; as it is written, 'And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights' (ibid); and he thus approached that dark cloud where God is enthroned. In this wise the departed spirits of the righteous dress themselves in the upper regions in luminous garments, to be able to endure that light which streams from the Lord of Light." (Sohar, i, 65b, 66a)

"The two feelings of love and fear are designed to aid the soul in achieving her high destiny, when she shall no more look through the dark glass, but see face to face in the presence of the Luminous Mirror, by permeating all acts of obedience and divine worship. And though perfect love, which is serving God purely out of love, like that higher knowledge, is to be man's destiny in heaven, yet the soul may attain some of it on earth, and endeavor to serve God out of love and not from fear, as thereby she will have an antepast on

earth of its union with the Deity, which is to be so rapturous and indissoluble in heaven.

“Yet is the service which arises from fear not to be depreciated, for fear leads to love. it is true that he who obeys God out of love has attained to the highest degree, and already belongs to the saints of the world to come, but it must not be supposed that to worship God out of fear is no worship. Such a service has also its merit, though in this case the union of the soul with the Deity is slight.

“There is only one degree which is higher than fear: it is love. In love is the mystery of the divine unity. It is love which unites the higher and lower degrees together; it elevates everything to that position where everything must be one. This is also the mystery of the words, 'Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one God.'" (Sohar, ii, 216a)

Let us now see an example of what is contained in the Cabala. For this, we will now quote from “The Esoteric Tradition,” by G. de Purucker, volume 1, page 62: “Turning to the Jews, one may find in the Zohar; a Hebrew word meaning ‘splendor,’ which is perhaps the greatest text-book of the Jewish Qabbalah, and which has been mentioned before, a statement to the effect that the man who understands the Hebrew bible in its literal meaning is a fool. ‘Every word of it,’ says the Zohar in this connexion, ‘has a secret and sublime sense, which the wise [that is, the initiated] know.’ One of the greatest of the Jewish Rabbis of the Middle Ages, Malmonides, who died in 1204 writes: “We should never take literally what is written in the Book of the Creation, nor hold the same ideas about it that the people hold. If it were otherwise, our learned ancient sages would not have been [sic, gone] to so great labor in order to conceal the real sense, and to hold before labor in order to conceal the real sense, and to hold before the vision of the uninstructed people the veil of allegory which conceals the truths that it contains.

“Taken literally, that work contains the most absurd and far-fetched ideas of the Divine. Whoever can guess the real sense, ought to guard carefully his

knowledge not to divulge it. This is a rule taught by our wise men, especially in connection with the work of the six days ...”

It is true that the Bible is written, to a great degree, in allegory and symbols, and if we don't understand them, we cannot grasp the message contained therein. The “Jews,” on the other hand, attach an occult meaning to every word and phrase. Their views of Scripture are so foreign to our perspectives one would not recognize them.

In spite of this, their view is not always entirely incorrect. From the above, it is obvious that the “Jews” do not believe in a six twenty-four hour day Creations as do some Christian fundamentalists. If we take the same stance as the anti-seedliners like Ted R. Weiland, Jeffrey A. Weekley, Stephen E. Jones, Jack Mohr, Charles Weisman, etc., that everything found in “Jewish” writings is evil, we will have to take the opposite position and start advocating a six, twenty-four hour day Creation also.

Can you see now how absurd some of the positions taken by the anti-seedliners are? You will remember, as we showed you before, if we throw everything out which can be found in the Talmud and other “Jewish” writings, we will have to pitch out most of the contents of our Bibles, along with the truth of our identity. One thing we have noticed with the anti-seedliners is they are strangely quiet about “Jewish” history, and never seem to quote “Jewish” history books. This should run up a red flag for us, indicating they're not as knowledgeable on the subject as they pretend to be. And that hardly qualifies them as students who have studied to show themselves approved. (2 Timothy 2:15) As we have said oft before, we need a Bible in one hand and a history book in the other (‘Jewish” history books without exception).

Referring again to “A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica,” by John Lightfoot, volume 2, page 209: “That nation and generation might be called adulterous literally; for what else, I beseech you, was their irreligious polygamy than continual adultery? And what else was

their ordinary practice of divorcing their wives, no less irreligious, according to every man's foolish or naughty will?"

Proselytes For Gain

Again on Lightfoot, volume 2, pages 295-297 concerning Matthew 23:13-14: "Under pretense of mighty devotion, but especially under the goodly show of long prayers, they so drew over the minds of devout persons to them, especially of women, and among them the richer widows, that by subtle attractives they either drew out or wrested away their goods and estates. Nor did they want nets of counterfeit authority, when from the chair they pronounced, according to their pleasures, of the dowry and estate befalling a widow, and assumed to themselves the power of determining concerning those things ... "Yet in making of these they used their utmost endeavors for the sake of their own gain, that they might some way or other drain their purses, after they had drawn in under the show of religion, or make some use or benefit to themselves by them. The same covetousness, therefore, under a veil of hypocrisy, in devouring widows' houses, which our Savior condemned in the former clause, he here also condemns in hunting after proselytes; which the scribes and Pharisees were at all kind[s] of pains to bring over to their religion, the greater drought they should have for gain, and the more purses to fish in.

These, therefore, being so proselyted, 'they made doubly more the children of hell than themselves.' For when they had drawn them into their net, having got their prey, they were no further concerned what became of them (this is how the Judeo-Christian Clergy on television, and on the radio act). They might perish in ignorance, superstition, atheism, and all kind[s] of wickedness: this was not matter of concern to the scribes and Pharisees; only let them remain in Judaism, that they might lord it over their consciences and purses."

Arab Proselytes to Judaism

The main index of the "History of the Jews," by Heinrich Graetz is found in volume y, and on page 512 are listed the various people proselyted by the "Jews" during their extended history. The list is too extensive to elaborate on here. We will key in on volume 3, pages 60-62 concerning the subtitle "Arabs Become Converted To Judaism" (approximately 450-500 A.D.): "Happily, the Arabian Jews bethought them of the genealogy of the Arabs as set forth in the first book of the Pentateuch, and seized upon it as the instrument by which to prove their kinship to them. The Jews were convinced that they were related to the Arabs on two sides, through Yoktan and through Ishmael. Under their instruction, therefore, the two principal Arabian tribes traced back the line of ancestors to these two progenitors, the real Arabs (the Himyarites) supposing themselves to be the descendants from Yoktan; the pseudo-Arabs in the north, on the other hand, deriving their origin from Ishmael. These points of contact granted, the Jews had ample opportunity to multiply the proofs of their relationship.

"The Arabs loved genealogical tables, and were delighted to be able to follow their descent and history so far into hoary antiquity; accordingly, all this appeared to them both evident and flattering. They consequently exerted themselves to bring their genealogical records and traditions into unison with the Biblical accounts. Although their traditions extended over less than six centuries on the one side to their progenitor Yarob and his sons or grandsons Himyar and Kachtan, and on the other, to Adnan, yet in their utter disregard of historical accuracy, this fact constituted no obstacle. Without a scruple, the southern Arabians called themselves Kachtanites, and the northern Arabians Ishmaelites. They readily accorded the Jews the rights of relationship, that is to say, equality and all the advantages attending it.

"The Arabs were thus in intimate intercourse with the Jews, and the sons of the desert whose unpoetical mythology afforded them no matter for inspiration, derived much instruction from Judaism. Under these circumstances many Arabs could not fail to develop peculiar affection for

Judaism, and some embraced this religion, though their conversion had not been thought of by the Jews. As they practiced circumcision while heathen, their conversion Judaism was particularly easy. The members of a family among the Arabs were indissolubly bound to one another, and, according to their phylarchic constitution, the individuals identified themselves with the tribe. This brought about, that when a chieftain became a Jew, his whole clan at once followed him, the wisest, into the fold of Judaism. It is expressly recorded about several Arabian tribes that they were converted to Judaism; such were the Benu-Kinanah, a warlike, quarrelsome clan, related to the most respected Koraishites of Mecca, and several other families of the tribes Aus and Chazaraj in Yathrib.

“Especially memorable, however, in the history of the Arabs is the conversion of the powerful king of Yemen. The princes or kings of Yemen bore the name of Tobba, and at times ruled over the whole of Arabia; they traced their historical origin back to Himyar, their legendary Origin to Kachtan...”

This is only one example of the extensive amount of “Jewish” proselytizing in history. This is the kind of history the anti-seedliner are mute on. Their incompetent, inept commentary bears record of their immaturity on the subject. You may think it is out-of-place for us to mention names of the anti-seedliners. Before we wrote on jot, Jeffery A. Weakley in his “The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History,” wrote on page 29: “If you have encountered an argument and you are sincerely seeking an answer [against Two Seedline], I suggest that first you completely study it out in god’s Word (look up definitions, check parallel passages, be sure of the context, etc.) After that we suggest you contact men such as Pete Peters, Dan Gentry, Earl Jones, Jack Mohr, etc....”

From Jeffrey A. Weakley’s comment, here, there can be little doubt where Pete Peters and the three others mentioned stand on Two Seedline. After Weakley, writing a book against the Two Seedline doctrine, you surely wouldn’t expect him to recommend someone who didn’t agree with him, would you? Jeffrey A. Weakley as an anti-seedliner, and he knew Pete Peters was

an anti-seedliner also. To the date of this writing, there is no public evidence that Pete Peters has changed his position on the subject, and we don't believe he ever will. He may make all kinds of derogatory statements about the "Jews," but he will never say, as our Messiah did, they are genetically Satanic.

At the present time, the enemy in this war has an agenda of convincing every White to jump in bed with a member of another race (mostly women, for they are more easily deceived). While all this is going on, the anti-seedliners proclaim: there isn't any enemy. They may deny they are making such a claim, but, by contradicting the Two Seedline truth, they are, in essence, making such an assertion. Therefore, all the blood of these White victims of "Jewish" propaganda is on their hands. They are actually aiding and abetting the enemy in their vicious plot to destroy the White, Israel Race. When you next observe the product of a mixed marriage, thank the anti-seedliners for their part in assisting the enemy in their diabolical plot. Also, those who are in support of the anti-seedliners become accessories after the fact. If you are not sure how your pastor stands on this issue, maybe you should ask him. Write and tell him that you would like to support him, but you can't as long as he doesn't teach Two Seedline. After all, it's your children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren who might race-mix as a direct or indirect result of the anti-seedliner's message. Wake up we are at WAR!

We really can't see a lot of difference between some of the Christian Identity preachers and John Hagee, for they both teach the "Jews" are "God's chosen people." John Hagee said: "Let me tell you this: Genesis 12:1 and 3 says: 'I will bless those that bless you, and I will curse those who curse you.' If something within you resents the Jewish people, that something is a demon spirit. The Jewish people, according to the Word of God, are the apple of God's eye. The nation of Israel is the object of God's affection. For David said: 'He that keepeth Israel (and the phrase 'keep' was a military term), he that defends Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps.' Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and Jesus Christ were all Jews."

Ted R. Weiland in his booklet “Eve, Did She Or Didn’t See?,” pages 68 & 94 make parallel statements to Hagee: “Seedliners claim that because the Pharisees and their progenitors were charged with the murders of all the righteous from Abel to Zaharias, they cannot be Israelites but instead must be Cainites of the seed of Satan. The truth is that because the Pharisees and their forefathers were indicted for the murder of the righteous martyrs, they cannot be Cainites but instead must be Israelites” ... “The Seedliners teach that the Pharisees were Cainites of the seed line of Satan, whereas Matthew 3:7-8, 27:6-10; John 7:19, 8:28-37; Acts 4:5-10, 24-35, and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were Judahites of the seedline of Jacob/Israel.”

Essentially, what both Hagee and Weiland are doing is putting their stamp of approval on our children marrying a cursed descendant of Cain, a “Jew.” We really fail to see much difference between those two. Again, Weiland will try to imply that Cain was a son of Adam with the same genetics as Abel. If this were true, it would again be approving of a marriage of our children with a “Jew.” To see if that is correct, let’s put it to the acid test. Inasmuch as both Weiland and Hagee are implying that the “Jews,” at the time of Messiah were “God’s chosen,” then, according to Scripture, if we bless the “Jews” we can only be blessed, or the Almighty is a liar.

In 1948, the state of Israeli was supposedly born. For 53 years now the United States has been pumping money into the Israel (the Israel-lie) in enormous amounts (billions upon billions). Sums of money that the ordinary person cannot even envision. No other nation in all history has pampered a people as the United States has molycoddled the Israeli. If the Israeli are God’s chosen, and if the Almighty’s words are true, the United States should be receiving blessings never before conceived. Let’s take a look at what these blessings consist of:

- 1). We are being blessed with an ever increasing abortion rate; well, praise God for that blessing.

2). We are being blessed with an ever increasing divorce rate; isn't that simply a wonderful blessing? Let's praise God for that one also.

3). We are told that homosexuality and lesbianism are on the increase; what marvelous blessings there are. Let's again praise God for those glorious blessings also.

4). Every day rape is on the upswing; isn't it just wonderful what God is doing for us?

5). Drug addiction is going out of control; isn't that a fabulous and wonderful blessing?

6). Personal debt is going through the ceiling;

7). Robbery and breaking and enterings are on the increase.

8). Children and adolescents are committing major crimes at a younger and younger age; what a wonderful new trend for the future.

If all of these things are blessing, we would really hate to see what a curse might be like. It would appear we were doing better when we weren't blessing the "Jews" as much. What does it all boil down to? Just this; If the "Jews" are "God's chosen people," as Weiland and Hagee claim, Yahweh is a liar, for under that perquisite, we should be the most blessed nation on the earth in all of history, for no nation has ever done more for the "Jews" than we. Now, Ted R. Weiland might deny he implied or said such a thing, but if you will check his booklet "Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?," it's exactly as we quoted him.

The Mental Seduction Theory

The prime argument used by the anti-seedliners is that Eve was "mentally" seduced rather than physically seduced. That is ludicrous. James 1:14-15

describes seven definite steps in the process of sin as follows: “But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.”

The seven steps are: (1) Temptation; evil thought, (2) Drawn away; strong imagination or fantasy, (3) Lust: delight in viewing, (4) enticed: weakening of the will, (5) Lust conceived: yielding, (6): sinful act committed, (7) Death: result of the actual sin.

Not only do the anti-seedliners err concerning the full mental and physical seduction of Eve, but they accuse the Almighty of unjust punishment for her sin. In order to see this, we will have to read Genesis 3:14-16: “And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. We can see from this, that the serpent, the woman, and Adam were punished in that order for their part in that seduction.

Yahweh always punishes in like-kind. The Bible makes it clear that if a man kills another in premeditated murder, his life is required in return. Yahweh always metes out punishment to fit the crime. In all Scripture, one cannot find a single incident where this is not true. Eve’s punishment in verse 16 is: (1) to bear children in sorrow, (2) her desire was to be reserved for her husband, and (3) she is to yield to her husband’s authority.

Let’s now zero in on the punishment of “bearing children,” “in sorrow.” The word “sorrow” is #6093 in Strong’s It means “worry, i.e., labor or pain...” Gesenius’ has it for Genesis 3:16: “...they pain and thy conception”;

Hendiadys for the pain of thy conception.” (“hendiadys” means; a figure in which a complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a copulative conjunction: ‘to look with the eyes and envy’ instead of ‘with envious eyes.’) In other words, “the pain of thy conception;” not “thy pain and thy conception.” Thus, there are three separate conclusions which can be Biblically drawn from Yahweh’s pronouncement to Eve: (1) That Eve would bear children in pain; that the pain would affect the very part of the body where the sin occurred. (2) That her [sexual] desire would return to her husband (Why did Yahweh even mention it if she were always true to Adam?). It is implied here that Eve’s desire had been to someone else. (3) That Eve would return and put herself under the authority of her husband rather than the influence of the serpent. Had Eve been guilty only of a mental crime, as the anti-seedliners so loudly proclaim. It would have been highly unjust for Yahweh to have punished her by causing her to bear children with physical pain. In his booklet, “Eve, Did Se Or Didn’t She?,” by Ted R. Weiland, he implies that Yahweh is unjust in his punishment where he says this on page 29: “The Bible is always its own best commentary, and it clearly attests to the fact that Eve was mentally deceived, not sexually seduced.”

Not only that, but Weiland scoffs at Dan Gayman’s work “The Two Seeds of Genesis 3:15,” on page, 16 where Gayman said: “In the divine punishment inflicted upon the woman Eve in Genesis 3:16 why did Almighty God employ the pain of childbirth? What is the purpose of the use of the word conception? How about the use of the word desire? The truth is: God made the punishment to fit the crime.”

There is one thing for sure, Weiland’s “hypothesis” of the account of Genesis 3:16 surely doesn’t fit the crime. If it did, when women bear children they would suffer severe mental anxiety without any physical pain. Stephen E. Jones in his “The Babylonian Connection,” (a work to repudiate Two Seedline), page 42 says: “We conclude then that when Eve explained to God that the serpent had ‘beguiled’ her, she meant that he had mentally deceived her. He corrupted the truth of God’s Word by peaching another

Jesus (God), another spirit, and another gospel, just as Satan's ministers have done all through the ages. And when Eve believed Satan's doctrine, she too was corrupted. Nawshaw, as used in Genesis 3:13, had nothing to do with physical seduction."

In his booklet "The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History," Jeffrey A. Weakley copycats the same argument that Eve was seduced mentally on pages 7-8. Here are some excerpts: "The seedliners will insist that it be translated 'seduce' and they define it as a physical sexual seduction because the English word 'seduce' can mean that. But can the word 'deceive' mean a sexual seduction?...When all these definitions are taken together as synonyms, the conclusion one comes to (if he is seeking to be honest) is that Eve was deceived in mind, **NOT SEXUALLY SEDUCED!**... So the first point the Satanic Seedline doctrine does not agree with the Scriptures; Eve was not sexually seduced, but rather she was mentally deceived."

Lt. Col. Jack Mohr in his "Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?," says, implying a mental only seduction of Eve. "In 2 Corinthians 11:3 the same Scripture writer indicates that Eve was beguiled in her mind, not through her sexual parts."

Charles Weisman at a Pete Peters camp retreat used the same argument as Stephen E. Jones, Ted R. Weiland and Lt. Col. Jack Mohr. The following is an excerpt from an audiocassette tape made at that meeting when Weisman, in an extended presentation, attempted to repudiate the Two Seedline message: "In 2nd Corinthians 11:3 Paul is concerned that the Corinthians would lose their faith and said: 'But I fear, lest somehow your minds be corrupted...' So he interprets this verse to mean something of a mental thing, a mental delusion, mentally delude, to lead astray, deceive, and that is just what the word means."

Not only did Weisman, like Weiland, Weakley, Jones and Mohr, use the same argument that Eve was only "mentally" seduced, but on this very same

audiocassette tape, he insinuates the Pharisees and Sadducees at the time of the Messiah were true blooded Israelites: "Now we go to Matthew 23. Now this is one of the questions that a guy who wrote me a letter asked about where in verse 35 it states 'That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias whom you slew between the temple and the altar.' Now, the statement about this verse by Satanic Seedline doctrine people is that they say, here, Christ identified his enemies as being the serpent race, and tells the Jews, who you're [sic., He's] talking to, that they are responsible for all that have been murdered upon the earth, even righteous Abel. Well, Christ here is speaking of a judgment that is to come upon Adamic man. And this judgment includes the murderers recorded in the Old Testament. Jesus did not say to these Jews that they were responsible for Abel's death. They [sic. He] said, all of his [sic their] blood will come upon you. So they are going to be judged. All of...all of...shed blood...innocent blood...is going to become upon...this...this people. And these people were the last of the Israelite order. And they were the last true representatives of the Adamic race under god's old order. So they were the ones who could be judged. So, He is not really saying they were guilty for Abels' death, but rather, it would come upon them. But He does say that they were guilty of killing Zacharias, which is recorded in 2nd Chronicles 24:21. They were stoned by this people or this...this nation. And in verse 31 [Matthew 23:31], Christ says to them, 'wherefore you be witnesses unto yourself that you are the children of them which killed the prophets.' So it's quite identifiable here which He's talking to. He's talking to Israelites. Just as Stephen said to these same people, 'which of the fathers have you not persecuted,' Israelites. These are the people that Jesus came to and spoke with and judged. They were not descendants of Cain, but Israelites, as only Israelites could be judged, not mongrels."

Christ said He was not to judge any man: "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man." (John 8:15)

Again for a second witness: “And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.” (John 12:47)

There is fairly good evidence that the words “son of Barachias” were never in the original script. “A Commentary On The Holy Bible,” edited by Rev. J.R. Dummelow points this out on page 701: “Zaharias son of Barachias: Jesus probably said ‘Zachariah’ as in Luke, without mentioning the father’s name, but the evangelist or one of the earliest copyists, who thought it necessary to distinguish among the twenty-nine Zacharias in the Old Testament, and understood the canonical prophet to be meant, added the words ‘son of Barachias...’”

The problem is: most of the prophets were after the Zechariah of 2 Chronicles 24:21. Therefore, it is more probably that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist is meant in Matthew 23:35, (see Protevangelion, chapter 16). In such a case, Yahshua did indeed mean all the righteous blood from Abel to Zacharias. Also, as we have pointed out that Josephus makes it quite clear that, outside of a minor few, the majority of Pharisees and Sadducees were not of the Tribe of Judah by birth, Josephus War 2:8:2.

Therefore, Weisman’s argument against Two Seedline doctrine is totally spurious. This also shows that it is highly likely that Weiland was parroting Weisman when he mistakenly, but unequivocally, claimed; the Pharisees and Sadducees were true descendants of “Jacob/Israel,” pages 68 and 94 of his booklet “Eve, Did she or Didn’t She?”

Charles Weisman concluded his totally erroneous presentation against the Two Seedline doctrine saying the following: “So why does this [Two Seedline] doctrine exist today? Well, it exists because we have a tendency within ourselves to not want to have evil and problems to come from within; we want them to come from without. And, therefore, if you tell somebody about a falsehood, about problems coming from without, some other people from

other groups will accept it, but if it's from within, it's less likely to be accepted. Sam problem when you try to tell people about the corruption and evil in American Government.

They just can't accept it, but if you tell them lies about some foreign country, or about some Saddam Hussein, they will accept that because now the corruption is from without. It's hard for us to accept that problems come from within ourselves, our family, our government, our nation, our race. It's more appealing and acceptable if they are from without. The Cain-Satanic seedline has problems and evil coming from without; an outside source, that being Satan. Who were the enemies of Israel in the bible? Most of them were offshoots of the Adam race [bull manure]. The Midianites, the Moabites, the Ammorites, the Edomites, the Amalekites, even a lot of the Canaanites. Remember Esau was your brother, and so was Cain, and so was Canaan, and so were those who stoned the prophets, and who killed Christ. The truth is that all the evil associated with the Jew today is from within. That is, it come from within people of the Adam race; those who were rejected by god, cursed by God, cast out etc. That is what, in part, constitutes the Jew today. Sort of the refuse of the Adamic race.

God throughout history has been pruning His vine, separating out from the original Adamic stock, people like Cain, and Canaan, and Esau, and others. In conclusion, the Satanic Seedline doctrine is not Scriptural, it's not logical; it is a false doctrine that I think we need to set aside and move on to the truth of what God has actually done in the earth..."

Again, I cannot emphasize how important it is to understand the formidable enemy with whom we have to contend. In order to fathom our present **WORLD PROBLEMS**, it is imperative we grasp two things: 1) That the White Europeans and their kin worldwide are the true racial Israelites of the Bible, and 2) Who Israel's real enemies are. To know one without the other is insufficient. To improperly identify Biblical Israel's enemy is a criminal offense, for it can mean the difference between life and death to our people.

Death is not always so obvious to the eye. When a white marries a member of another race, it brings on death of the Spirit which was breathed into our forefather Adam. If you are ever invited to attend a wedding of a White and a nonwhite, you are not attending a wedding, but a funeral. When the 23 chromosomes of the male sperm of a nonwhite unites with the 23 chromosomes of the egg of a White, it brings death to the 23 chromosomes of the egg of the White (and the other way around). Numbers 25:1-9 (especially verse 9). In that chapter, having intercourse with non-Israelites was considered the same as "death."

If you think the bombing of the Twin Trade Towers in New York was terrible, consider the death being brought about by miscegenation. This should give you some idea of what kind of WAR we are in, and who the players are. Now the key to understanding the WAR is found in Genesis 3:15. The anti-seedliners, by denying the truth of that passage, are aiding and abetting Israel's worst enemy. Actually, the anti-seedliners are doing more damage than the "jews" themselves. They call us Two Seedliners "seedliners," so the only thing we can dub them is "anti-seedliners."

"My Father" vs. "Your Father"

John 8:38 is one of the main supporting passages for Genesis 3:15:

"I (Christ) speak that which I (Christ) have seen with my Father (Almighty God): and ye (Jews) do that which ye (Jews) have seen with your (Jews) father (the devil)."

You will first notice, as properly applied by the translators, the one "father" is capitalized and the other one isn't. From this, it should be quite evident that the FATHER of the Messiah was not the same "father" as that of the so-called "Jews." Therefore, Scripture is talking about two separate genetic family trees. You might argue "this is speaking in a 'spiritual' sense." Yet, take a look at the next verse where it says: "Abraham is our father." That hardly sounds "spiritual," does it? It is not "spiritual" here, nor is it "spiritual" in John 8:44

where Christ tells certain people, later called “Jews,” who their father really was and is.

Further, it is stated “my Father” and “your father” indicating that our Savior had a different genetic Father than did the so-called “Jews.” the Greek word for “my” is #3450, while the word for “your” is #5216. Surely, this language should be clear enough to understand the “Pharisee,” “Scribes,” and “Sadducees” (the Jew) were, for the most part, definitely NOT of the same lineage as our Messiah. Yet, in spite of that evidence, this is what the anti-seedliners falsely maintain.

“IF”

In John 8 verse 39 it says: “‘IF’ ye were Abraham’s ‘CHILDREN.’ ye (Jews) would do the works of Abraham.” Then in verse 42 it says: “‘IF’ God were your (Jews) Father, ye (Jews) would love me.”

Questions;

1). Did the so-called “Jews” ever do the works of Abraham?

2). Did these same “Jews” ever love Him?

In order to understand what these passages mean, it will be necessary to qualify the Greek word “IF.” Actually, there are two Greek words translated “IF” in our English versions, and they are quite different. As a matter of fact, unless we investigate the true meanings of these words in the Greek, we cannot comprehend what is being said in the entire 8th chapter of John. The one word “IF” is #1487, and the other word “IF” is #1437 in the Strong’s Concordance. We are particularly interested in #1487 in this case. W.E. Vine does not deal with either of these. Strong’s explanations do little to make these understandable either. After searching through several Greek reference books, I found Dr. Spiros Zodhiates in his “The Complete New Testament

Word Study Dictionary” had the best general definitions for these two meanings. On pages 504 & 493 he says this of these two Bible words rendered “IF”: #1487:...el: conditional conjunctive. If. As such it expresses a condition which is merely hypothetical and separate from all experience in indicating a mere subjective possibility and differing from man (1437), if, which implies a condition which experience must determine, i.e., an objective possibility referring always to something future...” #1437: ...man...It differs from el in that el expresses a condition which is merely hypothetical, a subjective possibility; man implies a condition which experience must determine, an objective possibility, and thus refers always to something future...”

From this we can see in the Greek, for these two words, it is either a “hypothetical” IF or a “future” IF. For an example of a “future” IF, one might say: IF one will turn on the intuition, one might be able to start the engine. But the IF in our passages above is #1487, a “hypothetical” IF in nature. Thus, these verses might read something like this: Verse 39 saying: “IF (hypothetically) ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.” And verse 42 saying: “IF (hypothetically) God (Yahweh) were your Father, ye would love me.”

Surely, this strongly suggests that the greater part of the Pharisees , Scribes, and Sadducees were NOT the true children of Abraham of pure genetic seed! When faced with these statements of our Redeemer, the so-called “Jews” said, verse 41: “We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.”

Those so-called “Jews” wouldn’t have made such a statement if it hadn’t been implied in the discourse by our Savior in John chapter 8, for “fornication” means to race-mix. Yes, they understood His words very well, and they knew what the word “dl” (IF) meant, even though the anti-seedliners don’t seem to comprehend it today. Not only did the “Jews” understand the impetus of Christ’s words, but they understood well the sarcasm in which they were said.

There used to be a bumper sticker that read; "If you're so smart, why aren't you rich." Christ said: "IF ye were Abraham's children, you would do the works of Abraham."

In other words: "put up or shut up!" How much more evidence is needed to convince the anti-seedliners that those so-called "Jews" were not true pureblooded descendants of Abraham? We recognize that verse 37 says: "I know that ye are Abraham's seed," but it doesn't say "pure seed," and "never in bondage" confirms it in John 8:33. The Hebrew word "arab," #6154, means "a mixture or mongrel race." The Esau-Edomite "Jews," and the Arabs all have one thing in common; they are all "mamzers" (bastards).

"OF"

In John 8:47, Christ tells the "Jews": "He that is (genetically) OF God heareth God's words: YE therefore HEAR THEM NOT; BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT (genetically) OF God."

"The Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament," by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates devotes five pages to Devine and expound the word "OF" as used in the Greek, pages 529-534. Obviously, we cannot quote this entire document here, but cite only that which is relevant to John 8:44:

"#1537.. Preposition governing the genitive, primarily meaning out of, from of, as spoken of such objects which were before another...Of the origin or source of anything, i.e., the primary, direct, immediate source...OF PERSONS, OF THE PLACE, STOCK FAMILY, CONDITION, MEANING OUT OF WHICH ONE IS DERIVED OR TO WHICH HE BELONGS...Of the source, i.e., the person or thing, out of or from which anything proceeds, is derived, or to which it pertains..."

"The New Testament Greek Study Aids," by Walter Jerry Clark, says, on page 230, about the Greed word _k: "OUT OF...WITH THE GENITIVE: BY MEANS OF, OUT OF." The "Intermediate New Testament Greek," by Richard A.

Young, page 95 says the following about the Greek word $\epsilon\kappa$: " $\epsilon\kappa$ " often conveys special extensions 'out of' or 'from.' For example, the prophet said that God would call His Son out of Egypt." (Matthew 2:15) From "The Greek to English Interlinear," by George Ricker Berry, page 31 of his "Greek-English New Testament Lexicon," we have this on $\epsilon\kappa$: " $\epsilon\kappa$, or before a vowel, $\epsilon\kappa\varsigma$, a preposition governing genitive, from, out of." "The Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament," page 189 expresses $\epsilon\kappa$ this way: "...out of, as separation from, something with which there has been close connection..." John 8:47 has the same connotation as John 8:44, it means a chip off the old block. When it says the "Jews" are not "OF" God (Yah), it means it in a genetic way. But only those of us who are genetically "OF" God (Yahweh) can hear and comprehend His Word.

John chapter 10 warns us of this very thing. In John 10:26-27 Christ says the same thing to the "Jews," but puts it a little differently: "But YE (Jews) BELIEVE NOT, BECAUSE YE ARE NOT MY SHEEP, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me."

You may be wondering why we are so adamant concerning the Two Seedline doctrine. The reason is because, without properly identifying the enemy, the Identity Message is neutralized. It also tends to open the door for the enemy to worm his way into our midst. Once the enemy has established a beachhead among us, he can spread all kinds of misleading information and false doctrine ("leaven").

The "Jews" who are in the Herbert Armstrong camp are a good example of this. It should be obvious that the "Jews" would have the most to gain from an anti-seedline message. If the enemy can directly or indirectly influence those in Israel Identity to the fraud that there is no "seed of the serpent," he has them right where he wants them. Once the enemy has convinced Identity minded people there is no "seed (children) of the serpent," the "no-devil doctrine" invariably follows.

Once this erroneous premise is established, the next step is usually to identify the “devil” as the “flesh.” While it is true we do have a war with the flesh, this is not the same WAR as that which is being waged against “the seed (children) of the serpent.” To identify the flesh as the Satanic enemy is to grossly misdirect our energy. While the anti-seedline people are trying to analyze their own individual, personal, fleshly problems, the real enemy is bulldozing among their agenda to destroy the White Race. One cannot get any more neutralized than that. Paul speaks of it as “one that beateth the air.” David said the following about the enemy, Psalm 139:21-22, of which I am sure he wasn’t talking bout his “flesh”:

“Do not I hate them, O Yahweh, that hate thee? And am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with PERFECT HATRED: I count them mine enemies.”

Surely, the “devil” and the “flesh” can’t be the same thing. Yet this is what some who claim to be in the Identity Movement maintain. They try to claim that the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 were the “seeds of the spirit against the seeds of the flesh.” They are saying, in effect, that the “tree of knowledge” was the law, and when Eve ate of it, it brought on death; that the “enmity” between “thy seed and her seed” of Genesis 3:15 is the enmity between the “flesh and the spirit.” THIS IS JUST PLAIN STUPID!!! In other words, the flesh represents a seed line. In doing this, they are separating verse 15 from 14 as if it didn’t exist. Yahweh was directing His dialogue of the “serpent,” not the “flesh.” Let’s read the whole passage, Mr. Seedliner: “And Yahweh said to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou ART cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between THY SEED and HER SEED; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

Now if it is a war between the “spirit” and the “flesh,” it would have to read as follows.

“And the Lord God said to Eve’s flesh, Because thou hast done this, thy flesh is cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; and thy flesh shall go upon its belly, and dust shalt thy belly eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between the flesh of the woman and the spirit of the woman, and between the offspring of her flesh and the offspring of her spirit, and the offspring of her spirit shall bruise the head of the offspring of her flesh, and the offspring of her flesh will bruise the heel of the offspring of her spirit.”

SEE JUST HOW STUPID THAT IS, AND FOR ANYONE TO SPREAD THIS NONSENSE IS SPREADING FALSE TEACHINGS AND A FALSE DOCTRINE THAT IS NOT IN THE SCRIPTURE.

The “Law Tree” Hypothesis

Although some in Identity do not say it in terms of a “law tree,” they highly suggest that this is what the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” was which Eve partook of in the garden. We will quote some excerpts from Ted Weiland’s book by the same title as his ten audiocassette series, pages 40-44, and we are sure you will have to agree with our analysis of what he, in essence, is saying: “There are no scriptures that categorically tell us what the tree of knowledge of good and evil was... Genesis 3:22 clearly reveals that the knowledge of good and evil resides not with some demon of darkness, but rather with our omniscient God, Yahweh...God’s law itself is good because it reflects Yahweh’s nature. Consequently, Yahweh uses it as the vehicle through which the knowledge of good is commuted to man. The knowledge of evil is imported by means of the law as well... “Furthermore, Genesis 3:6 describes the tree. of the knowledge of good and evil as being able to make one wise, being pleasant to the eyes and good for food. These qualities also describe the law of God...At this point someone is likely to inquire ‘If the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the law of God, would not that have made God’s law evil because God did not want Adam and Eve to partake of it?’...There may be Christians, especially those who understand the vital

goodness and importance of God's law for us today, who may still have difficulty reconciling in their minds that Yahweh would ban His law from Adam and Eve. Such Christians should consider that when God prohibited Adam and Eve from partaking of the tree of life, that prohibition did not make the tree of life evil...So why would Yahweh want to keep Adam and Eve from His law?..“Perhaps God initially forbade Adam and Eve the knowledge of good and evil by way of His law because He knew He would have to hold them accountable to it, and He knew the heartache and death that would ensue as a result...On the other hand, if the eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil was an unlawful partaking of God's law, then there is a connection between Adam and Eve's sin and all other sin.”

Let's now sort out all this gibberish. What are the consequences of what he is saying? He is inferring that Yahweh deliberately withheld His Law from Adam and Eve so they wouldn't be condemned by their sin; that as long as they didn't know the Law, they were innocent, that by partaking of the Law, it brought about death. If he is correct (Yahweh forbid), and Adam and Eve had never partaken of the “law-tree” (as Stephen E. Jones calls it), we could conceivably be living in innocence today, partaking of every kind of immorality, and it would not be considered by Yahweh as sin because we never ate of the so-called “law-tree.” Wouldn't all the homosexuals of today love that situation?

Theory of Eating of The Law Tree

This idea is not original with Weiland or Stephen E. Jones, in his book “The Babylonian Connection,” pages 60-61, says this in part: “The tree of life (Grace) and the tree of knowledge (law) both were planted in the same garden by God. They grew together. The Law-tree provided the righteous standard; the Grace-tree provided the means by which the standard could be met...First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they recognized their mortality in contrast to God's immortality ...

Because they had broken His Law, they stood naked (mortal) and without excuse.” (What a bunch of lying, deceiving, antichrist propaganda).

All this is absolutely preposterous, for there is positively no Scriptural backing for such ideas as a “law tree,” or a “grace-tree,” or that the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are representative of the “seeds of the flesh” and “seeds of the spirit.” The term for seed in both the case of the woman and the serpent is **#2233 zera**, and is the same word used in Genesis 13:16 where Abram is promised by the Almighty that his “seed” would become “as the dust of the earth.”

If, in fact, Abraham had literal “seed,” so also must the serpent of Genesis 3:15 have literal “seed.” So where are the serpent’s “seed” then? You talk about “taking away,” “adding to” or “twisting,” this is the ultimate zenith of absurdity. It is obvious then, that the “woman,” the “serpent” and “Abraham” were all to have literal “seed” (Children).

Thus, to state that the “woman” was to have only one “seed” is also outrageously irrational for it does not literally follow. She was to have a single variety (species; like kind) of “seed” via Seth, of which one “seed” was to bruise the head of the serpent. All this makes one wonder who will be next in line to parrot this same spurious argument. Stop and think: Without the “seed” of the serpent, Christ’s heel could not be bruised; and without bruising of His heel, we have no Redemption.

Maybe you should be a tad more careful how we interpret Genesis 3:15. Repeating: If there was **NOT A LITERAL GENETIC OFFSPRING** of the “serpent” to bruise the “heel” of our Savior, then, **WE HAVE NO REDEMPTION!!!** It would appear the anti-seedliners have talked themselves into a corner from which there is no escape.

“A Murderer From The Beginning”

Again we cannot emphasize how important it is to understand the formidable enemy with whom we have to contend. In order to fathom our present WORLD PROBLEMS, it is imperative we grasp two things: (1) That the White Europeans and their kin worldwide are the True Racial Israelites of the Bible, and (2) Who Israel's real enemies are. To know one without the other is insufficient. To improperly identify Biblical Israel's enemy is a criminal offense, for it can mean the difference between life and death to our people.

Death is not always so obvious to the eye. When a White marries a member of another race, it being on death of the Spirit which was breathed into our forefather Adam. If you are ever invited to attend a wedding of a White and a nonwhite, you are not attending a wedding, but a funeral. When the 23 chromosomes of the male sperm of a nonwhite unites with the 23 chromosomes of the egg of a White, it brings death to the 23 chromosomes of the egg of the White (and the other way around).

This process is now happening in White countries every few minutes. In the Bible it is called a "plague," Numbers 25:1-9 (especially verse 9). In that chapter, having intercourse with non-Israelites, was considered the same as "death."

Speaking of Pearl Harbor, it is important to understand the complete facts surrounding the 'surprise attack.' While 95% of all respondents were opposed to war in 1939, about 90% indicated they were willing to fight if directly attacked.

Operating on this information, Jewry did everything possible to goad either Germany or Italy into attacking America. However, the bait was refused as Hitler was attempting at that time to negotiate a peace with England, which was flatly rejected by the Jew lackey Churchill.

Thus Jewry's attention turned toward Japan, which had a mutual defense pact with Germany and Italy. Japan had been engaged in a war with China which

FDR and the Jews tried to use as an excuse for American intervention, even though the events in Asia were of no concern to America. Jewish, not American, interests however were what concerned Roosevelt and in July 1941, he froze Japanese assets in the U.S. and embargoed trade.

This was reason enough to declare war, but Japan humbly proposed to sit down and negotiate U.S.-Japanese differences. Instead of accepting the offer, FDR INSULTED JAPANESE AMBASSADOR NOMURA AND REFUSED TO MEET WITH PRIME MINISTER KONOYE.

As a result, Konoye and his "peace party" were replaced by General Tojo and his "war party," yet Japan continued to make peace overtures only to have them all flatly rejected. FINALLY, ON NOVEMBER 26, 1941, ROOSEVELT SENT AN ULTIMATUM TO JAPAN WHICH AMOUNTED TO A VIRTUAL DECLARATION OF WAR. This ultimatum, according to Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, was actually drafted by the Jew Harry Dexter White [Weiss] in collaboration with Jew Treasury Secretary Harry Morgenthau. It was this ultimatum, penned by two Jews, that forced Japan to attack or else 'lose face,' which to Oriental thinking is a fate worse than death.

THE FINAL, SORRY EPISODE OF THIS DISGUSTING CHAIN OF EVENTS IS THAT WASHINGTON KNEW OF THE IMPENDING ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR AT LEAST 12 HOURS BEFORE THE BLOW FELL, BUT REFUSED TO WARN MILITARY OFFICERS THERE [What other name could this be known other than TREASON]. THE U.S. HAD BEEN FOREWARNED SINCE THE JAPANESE MESSAGE CODE HAD BEEN BROKEN AND AMERICA WAS THUS ABLE TO MONITOR JAPANESE DISPATCHES. NO WORD WAS SENT TO PEARL HARBOR BY FDR AND THE JEWS AS THE MESSAGES REVEALED THAT THE ATTACK SHOULD BE CALLED OFF IF IT APPEARED THAT THE AMERICANS WERE PREPARED.

So International Jewry by going through the 'back door' had successfully ensnared America into WW II; a war that would cost millions of lives and

billions of dollars. The bottom line of the war would be a world under the total subjugation of Jewry through its twin arms of Communism and Zionism. These facts have been covered up and ignored in the mass media, Charles Lindberg, for one, recognized where the finger of proof pointed. In his "Wartime Journals," he states that 'the Jews, the Roosevelt administration, and British sympathizers combined to encourage the U.S. to enter World War II.'

Lindberg and other patriots sought to stop Jewry's war plans by setting up the America First Committee. The committee found widespread support, but could not overcome the billions spent by Jews to brainwash the public into accepting war after Pearl Harbor. And it is Jewry which best recognized why the U.S. entered WW II.

'The American Hebrew,' in an editorial of July 24, 1942, declared that; "Whenever an American or a Filipino fell at Bataan or Corrugator or at any other of the now historic spots where MacArthur's men put up their remarkable fight, their survivors could have said with truth: The real reason that boy went to his death was because Hitler's Anti-Semitic movement succeeded in Germany. [can you not see it? World War II was because Germany and its people were being successful in their attempts to throw off the International Jewish Bankers Rule of their country; God what does it take for America to understand?]."

The above quotation from a Jew newspaper is an admission that the U.S. entered WW II only at the behest of World Jewry; a war Jewry declared all the way back in 1933!!! Of course, this admission was intended only for consumption by a Jewish audience to keep them in the know, which tends to make it all the more revealing.

“And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods. And Israel joined

himself unto Baal-peor: and the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel. And the LORD said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the LORD against the sun, that the fierce anger of the LORD may be turned away from Israel. And Moses said unto the judges of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-peor. And, behold, one of the children of Israel came and brought unto his brethren a Midianitish woman in the sight of Moses, and in the sight of all the congregation of the children of Israel, who were weeping before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And when Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, saw it, he rose up from among the congregation, and took a javelin in his hand; And he went after the man of Israel into the tent, and thrust both of them through, the man of Israel, and the woman through her belly. So the plague was stayed from the children of Israel. And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand.” (Numbers 25:1-9)

If you think the bombing of the Twin Trade Towers in New York was terrible, consider the deaths being brought about by miscegenation. This should give you some idea of what kind of WAR we are in, and who the players are. Now the key to understanding this WAR is found in Genesis 3:15. The anti-seedliners, by denying the truth of that passage, are aiding and abetting Israel’s worst enemy. Actually, the anti-seedliners, are doing more damage than the “Jews” themselves. They call us Two Seedliners “seedliners,” so the only thing that we can dub them is “anti-seedliners.”

“My Father” vs. “your father”

In John 8:38 is one of main supporting passages for Genesis 3:15:

“I speak that which I have seen with MY FATHER: And ye do that which ye have seen with YOUR FATHER.”

You will first notice, as properly applied by the translators, the one “father” is capitalized and the other one isn’t. From this, it should be quite evident that the “Father” of the Messiah **WAS NOT THE SAME** “father” as that of those so-

called “Jews.” Therefore, Scripture is talking about two separate genetic family trees. You might argue, “this is speaking in a ‘spiritual’ sense.” Yet, take a look at the next verse where it says: “Abraham is our father.” That hardly sounds “spiritual,” does it? It is not “spiritual” here, nor is it “spiritual” in John 8:44 where Messiah tells certain Judeans, later called “Jews,” who their father really was and is.

Further, it is stated “my Father” and “your father” indicting that our Savior had a different genetic Father than did the so-called “Jews.” The Greek word for “my” is #3450, while the word for “your” is #5216. Surely, this language should be clear enough to understand the “Pharisee” and “Sadducee” alleged “Jews” were, for the most part, definitely not of the same lineage as our Messiah. Yet, in spite of that evidence, this is what the anti-seedliners falsely maintain. They make the assertion as we have already shown you earlier; what is it that we don’t understand about the difference in the meanings of “my” and “your?” Most of them claim it is “spiritual.”

Theory of Eating of the Law Tree Not Original With Single Seedliners

This idea is not original with the single seedliners in a book “The Babylonian Connection,” by Stephen E. Jones, pages 60-61, says in part: “The tree of life (Grace) and the tree of knowledge (Law) both were planted in the same garden by God. They grew together. The Law-tree provided the righteous standard; the Grace-tree provided the means by which the standard could be met...First they disobeyed God by eating from the Law-tree, and for that act they were made mortal. Then their eyes were opened to know both good and evil, and they recognized their mortality in contrast to God’s immortality... Because they had broken His Law, they stood naked (mortal) and without excuse.” (Bull Hocky, Stephen Jones is an idiot—Willie Martin)

All this is absolutely preposterous, for there is positively no Scriptural backing for such ideas as a “law tree,” or a “grace tree,” or that the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are representative of the “seeds of the flesh” and “seeds of the

spirit.” The term for seed in both the case of the woman and the serpent is #2233 zera, and is the same word used in Genesis 13:16 where Abram is promised by the Almighty that his “seed” would become “as the dust of the earth.” If in fact Abraham had literal “seed,” so also must the serpent of Genesis 3:15 have literal “seed!”

So where are the serpent’s “seed” (children) then? You talk about “taking away,” “adding to” or “twisting;” this is the ultimate zenith of absurdity. It is obvious then, that the “woman,” the “serpent” and “Abraham” were all to have literal “seed” (children). Thus, to state that the “woman” was to have only one “seed” is also outrageously irrational for it does not literally follow. She was to have a single variety (species; like kind) of “seed” via Seth, of which one “seed” was to bruise the head of the serpent. All this makes one wonder who will be next in line to parrot this same stupid argument? Stop and think: Without the “seed” of the serpent, Christ’s heel could not be bruised; and without the bruising of His heel, we have no Redemption. Maybe we should be a tad more careful how we interpret Genesis 3:15. Repeating: If there was “not a literal genetic offspring’ of the “serpent” to bruise the “heel” of our Savior, then, **WE HAVE NO REDEMPTION**. It would appear the anti-seedliners have talked themselves into corner from which there is no escape.

A Murderer From The Beginning: This phrase is found in John 8:44, and the anti-seedliners make the claim that it has a “spiritual” connotation. For the life of us, we don’t know where they find a case “spiritual murder” in the Bible. Then again, maybe they have a different Bible than ours. We wish they would quote book, chapter and verse showing a single occurrence where someone was “murdered spiritually.” The word “murderer” in John 8:44 is #443, anthropoktonos, in the Greek and means “a manslayer.” It would seem if it had “spiritual” connotations, it would be defined as “spirit slayer.” But, try as we may, we can find no place where this word has such meaning.

Many of the commentaries attempt to point out that this doesn’t mean Cain, but the devil. Lt. Col Jack Mohr, makes this same claim on page 23 of his

“Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?” But thankfully, all commentaries do not agree on this. “The Nelson’s Illustrated Bible Dictionary,” says this on page 733: “MURDER: The unlawful killing of one person by another, especially with premeditated malice. After the Fall in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:1-24), it was not long before the FIRST MURDER occurred (Genesis 4:8), as Cain killed Abel his brother.”

It would appear from this that the killing of Abel by Cain is the first recorded murder in the Bible. While it is true that Satan’s beguiling brought on “death,” nowhere is it recorded as a “murder” as implied in the meaning of this Greek word. “The Complete New Testament Word Study,” by Spiros Zodhiates makes this observation on the Greek word #443 on page 179:

“anthropoktonos ... Homicidal, used substantively (not imaginary; real rather than apparent; actual) manslayer, one who commits homicide (John 8:44, 1 John 3:15) ...to kill, put to death.”

As you can see, Zodhiates includes both John 8:44 and 1 John 3:15 in this definition. And, if you will check 1 John 3:15, you will see that **IT IS SPEAKING OF CAIN** as recorded in 1 John 3:12, just three verses before it. Where do these anti-seedliners come up with all of this hocus-pocus about some kind of “spiritual murder?”

Stephen E. Jones implied this in his “The Babylonian Connection” on pages 70-71 where he said: “Remembering John’s definition that ‘he that committeth sin is of the devil,’ Jesus was simply saying that the Pharisees were doing the devil’s works. Since we have already seen that the devil could not have physically fathered Cain, nor any other human, the Pharisees were ‘of the devil’ idiomatically, not genealogically.”

Ted R. Weiland in his “Eve, Did She Or Didn’t See?” words it a little more cleverly, when on page 90 he says: “However, any well-versed Bible student knows that the Word of God is not always intended to be taken literally.” Then, on page 84 he asks this question: “However, is it a foregone conclusion that

the word 'father' used in John 8 has to be understood in a literal, physical sense? The seedliners declare: 'Absolutely.'

Well if the word "murderer" is literal, as we have just seen, then the word "father" would have to be literal also, would it not? Matthew 23:29-35 cites the murdered victims.

Jeffery A. Weakley, in his "The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History," parrots the same contention in a "question and answer" discussion conducted solely by himself on page 24; "Argument (of the Two Seedliners): John 8:44 says: 'Ye are of your father the devil...' This shows that the devil is their physical father." Answer (by Weakley): Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their spiritual father (the one that they serve)."

Lt. Col. Jack Mohr in his "Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?", page 26, put it this way: "Figuratively, I believe they are the special children of Satan and that as the Apostle Paul said: 'They please not God, and are contrary to all men.' (Thessalonians 2:15). But let us use care when we call them the literal, physical children of Satan, for we cannot prove this from the word." (Bull crap) While the current war concerning "terrorism" is taking on large proportions, it's only a mere skirmish in comparison to the great 7,000 year WAR of the "children of darkness" against the "children of light" foretold in Genesis 3:15. Every night White women are going to bed and waking up in the morning pregnant by a member of another race. In this greater war, we are taking tens of thousands of casualties rightly. While this large-scale war is going on, the Judeo-Christian church sits idly by claiming its Christian in nature, and they assert everything is alright as long as the other person has been "saved." And in the face of this great peril, the anti-seedliners refuse to point out the true enemy. They insist it's all a problem with the "flesh" or something "spiritual." Oh, they will recognize that Genesis 3:15 speaks of One "seed" in the form of the Messiah, but stubbornly deny the 'serpent' has "seed" also. We will repeat it again: If there was no "seed" of the serpent to bruise the heel

of the Messiah, then we have no Redemption. Now we would say that's a very dangerous and irresponsible position.

One person writes: "it's 99.9% religion, not race.' That also is a most risky position. We wrote him back and told him he could point his sword at religion, but we would point ours at a walking, talking breathing, genetic enemy. We don't know how he gets religion out of "seed" (zera). Furthermore, he also had much training at a seminary (cemetery). Well, the subject of "seminary" is what we are going to deal with now. One thing we have noticed in the Anglo-Israel message is that many who have been trained in seminaries are the very ones who take a position against Two Seedline.

We believe the reason for this is because in the various church seminaries the students are taught a religious system called "hermeneutics." We'll take a look at that system also. We think you will find it doesn't have a very commendable background. The greatest problem with people coming into Identity is that they tend to bring with them their former Judeo-Christian church's dogmas. With the Identity Message, one must wipe the slate entirely clean and reconsider all things from a new perspective.

It seems like everything is 180° from what we were always taught. Our Savior instructed us that we must become as a "little child" or we are not fit for the Kingdom. (Matthew 18:3) A child has a clean mind without any preconceived ideas. Even Paul had to go to Arabia for three years to get rid of his Parseeism. (Galatians 1:17-18) The problem in Identity is: A lot of people haven't been to the desert yet especially former seminary students who keep patching over Scripture attempting to put new wine (teachings) in old bottles. (Luke 5:36-39) In getting into this topic about "hermeneutics," we will start first by quoting the Encyclopedia Britannica, Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 11, page 671, the topic being "Hermes": "...the name of Hermes seems during the third and following centuries to have been regarded as a convenient pseudonym to place at the head of the numerous syncretistic writings in which it was sought to combine Neo-Platonic philosophy, Philonic Judaism and cabalistic

theosophy, and so provide the world with some acceptable substitute for the Christianity which had at that time begun to give indications of the ascendancy it was afterwards to attain... “The connection of then same of Hermes with alchemy will explain what is meant by hermetic sealing, and will account for the use of the phrase ‘hermetic medicine’ by Paracelsus, as also for so-called ‘hermetic freemasonry’ of the Middle Ages...”

The anti-seedliners accuse us Two Seedliners of using Talmudic teaching when many of them have been trained in seminaries using “cabalistic theosophical” thought. For further information concerning this type of teaching we will now quote from “The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, J.D. Douglas General Editor, page 466, the topic being “Hermetic Books:”

“It’s a collection of writings deal with religious and philosophical subjects and reflects a degree of syncretism with reference to Platonic, Stoic, Neo-Pythagorean, and Eastern religious thought. The collection dates from the second or third century and is ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus which represents a later designation for the Egyptian god Thoth, who was said to be the source and protector of all knowledge. The literary form of the Hermetic Books is basically that of the Platonic dialog. The single most significant of the several writings is ‘Poimandres,’ which tells of the soul’s ascent to God through the various spheres of the planets.”

We find more concerning this type of teaching in “The Nelson’s New Illustrated Bible Dictionary,” page 558: “Hermeneutics...the principles and methods used to interpret Scripture. Bible scholars believe a biblical text must be interpreted according to the language in which it was written, its historical context, the identity and purpose of the author, its literary nature, and the situation to which it was originally addressed.”

This all sounds good, but let’s investigate this thing a little deeper from “The Illustrated Hand-Book To All Religions,” © 1877, excerpts from the “Preface”:

“...The Primitive Church, for instance, would appear to be a congeries (a collection or heap) of discordant opinions, whose very names and titles are almost innumerable. Yet in fact there were but two great parties; the orthodox Christian on the one hand, and the heretical on the other; and these latter, amidst tier infinite varieties, are all reduced to two; the Gnostics, who corrupted the Gospel by an admixture of Greek philosophy or Persian Magianism, or both; and the Artisans, who lost themselves in speculations upon the Divine nature, and especially the two natures of Christ. All the controversies of the Reformation hinge again upon the one question of Sacramental Grace. And in our own times, apart from individual quarrels, eccentricities and errors, there are but three important differences in matters of doctrine through the whole of Christendom, namely, the Sacramental System of the Greek and Roman Churches, the Evangelical doctrines of Protestants, and the Rationalist or Neologian Creed...”

We really need to look into this matter about the “Gnostics.” We find this in the same book on pages 210-216: “Simon Magus is the generally reputed founder of the Gnostics; but Gnosticism was nothing else than the philosophical system of the times, leavened with a slight infusion of Judaism, and a still slighter portion of Christianity. It exhibited itself in its early days at Alexandria, whence it spread through Eastern Christendom.

“Alexandria was at that time the great seat of philosophy. It contained a vast number of Jews; and, being the great emporium of trade, it was of course much frequented by the early Christians...Amongst the intellectual idlers of a thriving city, the Platonic philosophy had superseded the coarse and vulgar forms of the old Egyptian superstition. The Alexandrian Jews were infected with it; for their language was Greek, and many of them had an extensive acquaintance with heathen literature. On the other hand, the Platonists studied the Jewish Scripture, and saw in them traces of pure and sublime theology...they even asserted that Plato had borrowed from the writings of Moses.

“Thus a compromise was attempted between the creeds of Moses and of Plato. There was a third element of error in the Persian or Magian doctrines; for Alexandria, open to the teachings of Greece on one side, was equally exposed to the fantastic theories of Orientalism on the other. And thus from these three sources; the philosophy of Plato, the religion of Moses, and the Magian superstition, a new system was created; this was Gnosticism...it did not arise within the Christian church, but it very soon infected the pure stream of Gospel truth...It was unquestionably the most formidable opponent with which the early Church had to contend... “The Gnostics practiced magic, which they learned from the East...Christianity no sooner appeared than the Gnostics incorporated it into their system, but so as not merely to corrupt, but to subvert it...but they (the Gnostics) taught also that the body of Jesus was a phantom, and that Christ was neither born, nor suffered upon the cross (stake)...Thus the doctrine of the atonement and of faith in the death of Christ found no place whatever in their system...From Paul’s first Epistle to the Corinthians, it is evident that Gnosticism had already shown itself in Greece. He repeatedly used the term gnosis, in a peculiar sense, as arrogated by a certain party, e.g., 1 Corinthians 8:1...The Gnostics denied that there was, in any sense, a resurrection of the body...Whatever the Christians said of a resurrection, they interpreted figuratively; according to them, the Gnostic rose from death to life when he was initiated in their mysteries and made perfect in their knowledge... “Simon Magus was probably the first of the Gnostics who engrafted the name of Christ into their system; he and his followers maintained that the body of Jesus was a phantom...but they utterly denied the doctrine of his atonement. In fact, when a Christian adopted the Gnostic views, he ceased to be a Christian, for he renounced his faith in a Redeemer and his hope of a resurrection. In the first century the Church of Christ, with one voice, agreed in this view of the Gnostic system: namely, that Gnostics were not Christians...The Greek philosophy, and particularly the writings of Plato, were the assignable study, and therefore, we may venture to say, were embraced by great numbers by whom they were imperfectly understood. “And yet something more certain, more religious, was wanted. This the Jew supplied, and Gnosticism was formed...Gnosticism was an attempt (so far as it

assumed the Christian garb) to effect a compromise between the gospel. And heathenism as refined by philosophy and leavened with Judaism...From its expiring ashes Mohammed kindled a new and fiercer flame. Gnosticism, with its magic, its angelic powers, its mystical dogmas, its affected contempt of the body and of death, and its real licentiousness, was absorbed into the system of the impostor, or fanatic, of Mecca.”

Again, on page 488 of the same book we read: “Anti-Trinitarians...Cerinthus was doubtless contemporary with John, although he may have been alive after the death of the apostle. He was a Jew, who had studied philosophy at Alexandria, but he spent the greater part of his life in Asia Minor. His system was probably a mixture of Judaism, Gnosticism and Christianity. Irenæus makes him a complete Gnostic, saying of him. ‘He taught that the world was not made by the supreme God, but a certain power (the demi-urgos) separate from him, and below him, and ignorant of him. Jesus he supposed not to be born of a virgin, but to be the son of Joseph and Mary; born altogether as other men are...”

Being Jew, Simon Magus was merely expressing what he had been taught by the Jewish Elders of whom Christ condemned as subverting the Word of God, and teaching for doctrine the doctrines of men.

The Jews Believe in More than Thirty Gods!

Now THESE SEPHIROTH, OR THE WORLD OF EMANATIONS, OR THE ATZILATIC WORLD, GAVE BIRTH TO THREE WORLDS IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER: FROM THE CONJUNCTION [copulation] OF THE KING AND QUEEN, OR THE BRIATIC WORLD, ALSO CALLED THE THRONE, WHICH IS THE ABODE OF PURE SPIRITS, AND WHICH, LIKE ITS PARENTS, CONSISTS OF TEN SEPHIROTH, OR EMANATIONS.

The Briatic World, again, gave rise to, (2). The Word of Formation, or the Jetziratic World, which is the habitation of the angels, and also consists of ten Sephiroth; whilst the Jetziratic World, again, sent forth. (3). The World of

Action, or the Assiatic World, also called the World of Keliphoth, which contains the Spheres and matter, and is the residence of the Prince of Darkness and his legions. Or, as the Sohar describes it: "After the Sephiroth, and for THEIR use, God made the Throne (the world of Creation), with four legs and six steps, thus making ten (the decade of Sephiroth which each world has)...For this Throne and its service he formed the ten Angelic hosts (the World of Formation), Malachim, Arelim, Chajoth, Ophanim, Chashmalim, Elim, Elohim, Benei Elohim, Ishim, and Seraphim, and for their service, again, he made Samaël and his legions (the World of Action), who are, as it were, the clouds upon which the angels ride in their descent on the earth, and serve, as it were, for their horses. Hence it is written: 'Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt.'" ((Isaiah xix, 1) (Sohar ii, 43a)) **THERE ARE, therefore, FOUR WORLDS**, each of which has a separate Sephiric system, consisting of a decade of emanations.

(1). The Atzilatic World, called alternately the World of Emanations, the Image (== with prefixed), and the Heavenly Man, which, by virtue of its being a direct emanation from God and most intimately allied with the Deity, is perfect and immutable.

(2). The Briatic World, called the World of Creation and the Throne which is the immediate emanation of the former, and whose ten Sephiroth, being further removed from the En Soph, are of a more limited and circumscribed potency, through the substances they comprise are of the purest nature and without any admixture of matter.

(3). The Jetziratic World, called the World of Formation and the World of Angels, which proceeded from the former world, and whose ten Sephiroth, though of a still less refined substance than the former, because further removed from the primordial source, are still without matter. It is in this angelic world where those intelligent and incorporeal beings reside, who are wrapped in a luminous garment, and who assume a sensuous form when they appear to man. And;

(4). The Assiatic World, called the World of Action and the World of Matter which emanated from the preceding world, the ten Sephiroth of which are made up of the grosser elements of all the former three worlds, and which has sunk down in consequence of its materiality and heaviness. Its substances consist of matter limited by space and perceptible to the senses in a multiplicity of forms. It is subject to constant changes, generations, and corruptions, and is the abode of the Evil Spirit.

Before leaving this doctrine about the creation of the relationship of the Supreme Being to the universe, we must reiterate two things.

(1). Though the trinity of the Sephiroth gave birth to the universe, or, in other words, is an evolution of the emanations, and is thus a further expansion of the Deity itself, it must not be supposed that the Kabbalists believe in a Trinity in our sense of the word. Their view on this subject will best be understood from the following remark in the Sohar: "Whoso wishes to have an insight into the sacred unity, let him consider a flame rising from a burning coal or a burning lamp. He will see first a twofold light, a bright white and a black or blue light; the white light is above, and ascends in a direct light, whilst the blue or dark light is below, and seems as the chair of the former, yet both are so intimately connected together that they constitute only one flame. The seat, however, formed by the blue or dark light, is again connected with the burning matter which is under it again. The white light never changes its color, it always remains white; but various shades are observed in the lower light, whilst the lowest light, moreover, takes two directions, above it is connected with the white light, and below with the burning matter. Now this is constantly consuming itself, and perpetually ascends to the upper light, and thus everything merges into a single unity." (Sohar, I, 51a)

(2). THE CREATION, OR THE UNIVERSE, IS SIMPLY THE GARMENT OF GOD WOVEN FROM THE DEITY'S OWN SUBSTANCE; OR, AS SPINOZA EXPRESSES IT, GOD IS THE IMMANENT BASIS OF THE UNIVERSE. For

although, to reveal himself to us, the Concealed of all the Concealed sent forth the TEN EMANATIONS CALLED THE FORM OF GOD, FORM OF THE HEAVENLY MAN, yet since even this luminous form was too dazzling for our vision, it had to assume another form, or had to put on another garment which consists of the universe. THE UNIVERSE, therefore, or THE VISIBLE WORLD, is a further expansion of THE DIVINE SUBSTANCE, and is called THE KABBALAH "THE GARMENT OF GOD."

Thus we are told, "when the Concealed of all the Concealed wanted to reveal himself, he first made a point [the first Sephira], shaped it into a sacred form [the totality of the Sephiroth], and covered it with a rich and splendid garment that is the world." (Sohar, I, 2a)

(3). The Creation of Angels and Men.

The different worlds which successively emanated from the En Soph and from each other, and which sustain the relationship to the Deity of first, second, third, and fourth generations, are, with the exception of the first (the World of Emanations), inhabited by spiritual beings of various grades.

"God animated every part of the firmament with a separate spirit, and forthwith all the heavenly hosts were before him. This is meant by the Psalmist, when he says, (Psalm xxxiii, 6) 'By the breath of his mouth were made all their hosts.'" (Sohar, iii, 68a)

These angels consist of two kinds, good and bad; they have their respective princes, and occupy the three habitable worlds in the following order. As has already been remarked, the first world, or the Archetypal Man, in whose image everything is formed, is occupied by no one else. The angel Metatron occupies the second or the Briatic World, which is the first habitable world; he alone constitutes the world of pure spirits. He is the garment of the visible manifestation of the Deity; his name is numerically equivalent to that of the Lord. (Sohar, iii, 231a)

He governs the visible world, preserves the unity, harmony, and the revolutions of all the spheres, planets and heavenly bodies, and is the Captain of the myriads of the angelic hosts who people the second habitable or the Jetziratic World, and who are divided into ten ranks, answering to the ten Sephiroth. EACH OF THESE ANGELS IS SET OVER A DIFFERENT PART OF THE UNIVERSE. ONE HAS THE CONTROL OF ONE SPHERE, ANOTHER OF ANOTHER HEAVENLY BODY; ONE ANGEL HAS CHARGE OF THE SUN, ANOTHER OF THE MOON, ANOTHER OF THE EARTH, ANOTHER OF THE SEA, ANOTHER OF THE FIRE, ANOTHER OF THE WIND, ANOTHER OF THE LIGHT, ANOTHER OF THE SEASONS etc.,; and the question, however, about the doctrine of the Trinity in other passages of the Sohar will be discussed more amply in the sequel, where we shall point out the relation of the Kabbalah to Christianity.

The Kabbalistic description of Metatron is taken from the Jewish angelogy of a much older date than this theosophy.

Thus Ben Asai and Ben Soma already regard the divine voice, as Metatron. (Beresh. Rab., Parsha v) He is called the Great Teacher, the Teacher of Teachers, and it is for this reason that Enoch, who walked in close communion with God, and taught mankind by his holy example, is said by the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan b. Uzziel, to 'have received the name Metatron, the Great Teacher' after he was transplanted. (Genesis v, 24) Metatron, moreover, is the Presence Angel, the Angel of the Lord that was sent to go before Israel; (Exodus xxiii, 21) he is the visible manifestation of the Deity, for in him is the name of the Lord, his name and that of the Deity are identical, inasmuch as they are of the same numerical value (viz.: and are the same according to the exegetical rule called Gematria, $10 + 4 + 300 = 314$; $50 + 6 + 200 + 9 + 9 + 40 = 314$. (See Rashi on Exodus xxiii, 21, and Sanhedrin 38b)

So exalted is Metatron's position in the ancient Jewish angelology, that we are told that when Elisha b. Abnja, also called Acher, saw this angel who occupies

the first position after the Deity, he exclaimed, 'Peradventure, but far be it, **THERE ARE TWO SUPREME POWERS.**' (Talmud, Chagiga, 15a) The etymology is greatly disputed; but there is no doubt that it is to be derived from metator, messenger, outrider, way maker, as has been shown by Elias Levita, and is maintained by Cassel. (Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopädie, section ii, vol. xxvii, s.v.; Juden, p. 40, note 84)

Sachs (beiträge zur Sprachund Alterthumsforschung, vol. I, Berlin 1852, p. 108) rightly remarks that this etymology is fixed by the passage from siphra, (quoted in kaphter-Va-Pherach, c. x, p. 34b) the finger of God was the messenger or guide to Moses, and showed him all the land of Israel. The termination has been appended to obtain the same numerical value. The derivation of it from the angel is immediately under the divine throne, which is maintained by Frank, (Kabbala, p. 43) Graetz (Gnosticismus, p. 44) and others, has been shown by Frankel (Zeitschrift, 1846 vol. iii, p. 113) and Cassel, (Ersch und Gruber's Encyklop. section ii, vol. xxvii, p. 41) to be both contrary to the form of the word and to the description of Metatron. **THESE ANGELS DERIVE THEIR NAMES FROM THE HEAVENLY BODIES THEY RESPECTIVELY GUARD.** Hence one is called Venus, one Mars, one the substance of Heaven, one the angel of light, and another the angel of fire. (Comp. Sohar I, 42, etc.) The demons, constituting the second class of angels, which are the grossest and most deficient of all forms, and are the shells of being, inhabit the third habitable or Assiatic World.

They, too, form ten degrees, answering to the decade of Sephiroth, in which darkness and impurity increase with the descent of each degree. Thus the two first degrees are nothing more than the absence of all visible form and organization, which the Mosaic cosmology describes in the words before the hexahemeron, and which the Septuagint renders.

The third degree is the abode of the darkness which the book of Genesis describes as having in the beginning covered the face of the earth.

Whereupon follow seven infernal halls == Hells, occupied by the demons,

which are the incarnation of all human vices, and which torture those poor deluded beings who suffered themselves to be led astray in this world. These seven infernal halls are subdivided into endless compartments, as to afford a separate chamber of torture for every species of sin.

The prince of this region of darkness, who is called Satan in the Bible, is denominated by the Kabbalah, Samaël == angel of poison or of death. **HE IS THE SAME EVIL SPIRIT, SATAN, THE SERPENT, WHO SEDUCED EVE.** He has a wife, called the Harlot or the Woman of Whoredom, but they are both generally represented as united in the one name of the Beast. (Comp. Sohar, ii, 255-259, with I, 35b)

The whole universe, however, was incomplete, and did not receive its finishing stroke till man was formed, who is the acme of the creation, and the microcosm uniting in himself the totality of beings.

"THE HEAVENLY ADAM (the ten Sephiroth), who emanated from the highest primordial obscurity (the En Soph), CREATED THE EARTHLY ADAM." (Sohar, ii, 70b)

"Man is both the import and the highest degree of creation, for which reason he was formed on the sixth day. As soon as man was created, everything was complete, including the upper and nether worlds, for everything is comprised in man. He unites in himself all forms." (Sohar, iii, 48a)

Man was created with faculties and features far transcending those of the angels. The bodies of the protoplasts were not of that gross matter which constitutes our bodies. **ADAM AND EVE, BEFORE THE FALL, WERE WRAPPED IN THAT LUMINOUS ETHEREAL, SUBSTANCE IN WHICH THE CELESTIAL SPIRITS ARE CLAD, AND WHICH IS NEITHER SUBJECT TO WANT NOR TO SENSUAL DESIRES.**

They were envied by the angels of the highest rank. The fall, however, changed it all, as we are told in the following passage: "When Adam dwelled in the garden of Eden, he was dressed in the celestial garment, which is a garment of heavenly light. But when he was expelled from the garden of Eden, and became subject to the wants of this world, what is written? 'The Lord God made coats of skins unto Adam and to his wife, and clothed them'; (Genesis iii, 21) for prior to this they had garments of light, light of that light which was used in the garden of Eden." (Sohar, ii, 229b)

"The garments of skin, therefore, mean our present body, which was given to our first parents in order to adapt them to the changes which the fall introduced. But even in the present form, the righteous are above the angels, and every man is still the microcosm, and every member of his body corresponds to a constituent part of the visible universe.

"What is man? Is he simply skin, flesh, bones, and veins? No! That which constitutes the real man is the soul, and those things which are called the skin, the flesh, the bones, and the veins, all these are merely a garment, they are simply the clothes of the man, but not the man himself. When man departs, he puts off these garments wherewith the son of man is clothed. Yet are all these bones and sinews formed in the secret of the highest wisdom, after the heavenly image. "The skin represents the firmament, which extends everywhere, and covers everything like a garment, as it is written, 'Who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain.' (Psalm clv, 2) The flesh represents the deteriorated part of the world...the bones and the veins represent the heavenly chariot, the inner powers, the servants of God...But these are the outer garments, for in the inward part is the deep mystery of the heavenly man. Everything here below, as above, is mysterious.

"Therefore it is written: 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him'; (Genesis I, 27) repeating the word God twice, one for the man and the other for the woman. The mystery of the earthly man is after the mystery of the Heavenly man.

"And just as we see in the firmament above, covering all things, different signs which are formed of the stars and planets, and which contain secret things and profound mysteries, studied by those who are wise and expert in these signs; so there are in the skin, which is the cover of the body of the son of man, and which is like the sky that covers all things, signs and features which are the stars and planets of the skin, indicating secret things and profound mysteries, whereby the wise are attracted, who understand to read the mysteries in the human face." (Sohar, ii, 76a)

He is still the presence of god upon earth [this is where the humanist religion was born. That man is god!], and the very form of the body depicts the Tetragrammation, the most sacred name Jehovah.

Thus the head is the form of the arms and the shoulders are like the breast represents the Sephiroth from which it emanates, **EVERY SOUL HAS TEN POTENCIES, WHICH ARE SUBDIVIDED INTO A TRINITY OF TRIADS, AND RESPECTIVELY REPRESENTED BY:**

(1) The Spirit, which is the highest degree of being, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by The Crown, representing the highest triad, in the Sephiroth, called the Intellectual World;

(2) The Soul, which is the seat of good and evil, as well as the moral qualities, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Beauty, representing the second triad in the Sephiroth, called the Moral World; and

(3) The Cruder Spirit, which is immediately connected with the body, is the direct cause of its lower functions, instincts, and animal life, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Foundation, representing the third triad in the Sephiroth, called the Material World.

In its original state each soul is androgynous, and is separated into male and female when it descends on earth to be borne in a human body. We have seen that the souls of the righteous, in the world of spirits, are superior in dignity to the heavenly powers and the ministering angels. It might, therefore, be asked why do these souls leave such an abode of bliss, and come into this vale of tears to dwell in tabernacles of clay? The only reply to be given is that these happy souls have no choice in the matter. Indeed we are told that the soul, before assuming a human body, addresses God: "Lord of the Universe! I am happy in this world, and do not wish to go into another world, where I shall be a bond-maid, and be exposed to all kinds of pollutions." (Sohar, ii, 96)

And can you wonder at this pitiful ejaculation? Should your philanthropic feelings and your convictions that our heavenly Father ordains all things for the good of his children, impel you to ask that an explanation of this mystery might graciously be vouchsafed to you in order to temper your compassion and calm your faith, then take this parable: **"A SON WAS BORN TO A KING; HE SENDS HIM TO THE COUNTRY, THERE TO BE NURSED AND BROUGHT UP TILL HE IS GROWN UP, AND INSTRUCTED IN THE CEREMONIES AND USAGES OF THE ROYAL PALACE. WHEN THE KING HEARS THAT THE EDUCATION OF HIS SON IS FINISHED, WHAT DOES HIS FATHERLY LOVE IMPEL HIM TO DO? FOR HIS SON'S SAKE HE SENDS FOR THE QUEEN HIS MOTHER, CONDUCTS HIM INTO THE PALACE AND MAKES MERRY WITH HIM ALL DAY.**

"Thus the Holy One, blessed be he, has a son with the Queen [Here the Jews are saying it is alright for a man to make love with his own mother!]: this is the heavenly and sacred soul. He sends him into the country, that is into this world, therein to grow up and to learn the customs of the court. When the King hears that this his son has grown up in the country, and that it is time to bring him into the palace, what does his love for his son impel him to do? He sends, for his sake, for the Queen and conducts him to the palace." (Sohar, I, 215b) As has already been remarked, the human soul, before it descends into the world, is androgynous, or in other words, consists of two component parts,

each of which comprises all the elements of our spiritual nature. Thus the Sohar tells us: "Each soul and spirit, prior to its entering into this world, consists of a male and female united into one being. When it descends on this earth the two parts separate and animate two different bodies.

"At the time of marriage, the Holy One, blessed be he, who knows all souls and spirits, unites them again as they were before, and they again constitute one body and one soul, forming as it were the right and left of one individual; therefore 'There is nothing new under the sun.' (Ecl. I, 9) This union, however, is influenced by the deeds of the man and by the ways in which he walks. The soul carries her knowledge with her to the earth, so that 'everything which she learns here below she knew already, before she entered into this world.'"

(Sohar, iii, 61b)

Since the form of the body as well as the soul, is made after the image of the Heavenly Man, a figure of the forth-coming body which is to clothe the newly descending soul, is sent down from the celestial regions, to hover over the couch of the husband and wife when they copulate, in order that the conception may be formed according to this model.

"At connubial intercourse on earth, the Holy One, blessed be he, sends a human form which bears the impress of the divine stamp. This form is present at intercourse, and if we were permitted to see it we should perceive over our heads an image resembling a human face; and it is in this image that we are formed. As long as this image is not sent by God and does not descend and hover over our heads, there can be no conception, for it is written: 'And God created man in his own image.' (Genesis I, 27)

"This image receives us when we enter the world, it develops itself with us when we grow, and accompanies us when we depart this life; as it is written: 'Surely, man walked in an image': (Psalm xxxvii, 5) and this image is from heaven. When the souls are to leave their heavenly abode, each soul separately appears before the Holy King, dressed in a sublime form, with the features in which it is to appear in this world. It is from this sublime form that

the image proceeds. It is the third after the soul, and precedes it on the earth; it is present at the conception, and there is no conception in the world where this image is not present." (Sohar, iii, 104a-b)

All human countenances are divisible into the four primordial types of faces, which appeared at the mysterious chariot throne in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, viz., the face of man, of the lion, the ox and the eagle. Our faces resemble these more or less according to the rank which our souls occupy in the intellectual or moral dominion; "And physiognomy does not consist in the external lineaments, but in the features which are mysteriously drawn in us. The features in the face change according to the form which is peculiar to the inward face of the spirit. It is the spirit which produces all those physiognomical peculiarities known to the wise; and it is only through the spirit that the features have any meaning. All those spirits and souls which proceed from Eden (the highest wisdom) have a peculiar form, which is reflected in the face." (Sohar, ii, 73b)

The face thus lighted up by the peculiar spirit inhabiting the body, in the mirror of the soul; and the formation of the head indicates the character and temper of the man. An arched forehead is a sign of a cheerful and profound spirit, as well as of a distinguished intellect; a broad but flat forehead indicates foolishness and silliness; whilst a forehead which is flat, compressed on the sides and spiral, betokens narrowness of mind and vanity. (Comp. Sohar, ii, 71b, 75a)

As a necessary condition of free existence and of moral being, the souls are endowed by the Deity, from the very beginning, with the power of adhering in close proximity to the primordial source of infinite light from the very beginning, with the power of adhering in close proximity to the primordial source of infinite light from which they emanated, and of alienating themselves from that source and pursuing an independent and opposite course.

Hence, Simon ben Jochai said, "If the Holy One, blessed be he, had not put within us both the good and the evil desire, which are denominated light and darkness, the created man would have neither virtue nor vice. For this reason it is written: 'Behold, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.' (Deuteronomy xxx, 15) To this the disciples replied, Wherefore is all this? Would it not be better if reward and punishment had not existed at all, since in that case man would have been incapable of sinning and of doing evil. He rejoined, It was meet and right that he should be created as he was created, because the Law was created for him, wherein are written punishments for the wicked and rewards for the righteous; and there would not have been any reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked but for created man." (Sohar I, 23a)

So complete is their independence, that souls, even in their pre-existent state, can and do choose which way they intend to pursue.

"All souls which are not guiltless in this world, have already alienated themselves in heaven from the Holy One, blessed be he; they have thrown themselves into an abyss at their very existence, and have anticipated the time when they are to descend on earth...Thus were the souls before they came into this world." (Sohar, iii, 61b)

(4). The Destiny of Man and the Universe.

As the En Soph constituted man the microcosm, and as the Deity is reflected in this epitome of the universe more than in any component part of the creation, all things visible and invisible are designed to aid him in passing through his probationary state here below, in gathering that experience for which his soul has been sent down, and in returning in a pure state to that source of light from which his soul emanated.

This destiny of man, the reunion with the Deity from which he emanated, is the constant desire both of God and man, and is an essential principle of the

soul, underlying its very essence. Discarding that blind power from our nature, **WHICH GOVERNS OUR ANIMAL LIFE** [This is where Darwin got the idea for the origin of the species], which never quits this earth, and which therefore plays no part in our spiritual being, the soul possesses two kinds of powers and two sorts of feelings.

It has the faculty for that extraordinary prophetic knowledge, which was vouchsafed to Moses in an exceptional manner, called the Luminous Mirror (speculator), and the ordinary knowledge termed the Non-Luminous Mirror, respectively represented in the earthly Paradise by the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil; and it possesses the higher feeling of love and the lower feeling of fear. Now the full fruition of that higher knowledge and of that loftier feeling of love can only be reaped when the soul returns to the Infinite Source of Light, and is wrapped in that luminous garment which the protoplasts forfeited throughout the fall.

Thus we are told, "Come and see when the soul reaches that place which is called the Treasury of Life, she enjoys a bright and luminous mirror, which receives its light from the highest heaven. The soul could not bear this light but for the luminous mantle which she put on. For just as the soul, when sent to this earth, puts on an earthly garment to preserve herself here, so she receives above a shining garment, in order to be able to look without injury into the mirror whose light proceeds from the Lord of Light. Moses too could not approach to look into that higher light which he saw, without putting on such an ethereal garment: as it is written: 'And Moses went into the midst of the cloud.', (Exodus xxiv, 18) which is to be translated by means of the cloud wherewith he wrapped himself as if dressed in a garment. At that time Moses almost discarded the whole of his earthly nature; as it is written, 'And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights' (ibid); and he thus approached that dark cloud where God is enthroned. In this wise the departed spirits of the righteous dress themselves in the upper regions in luminous garments, to be able to endure that light which streams from the Lord of Light." (Sohar, I, 65b, 66a)

The two feelings of love and fear are designed to aid the soul in achieving her high destiny, when she shall no more look through the dark glass, but see face to face in the presence of the Luminous Mirror, by permeating all acts of obedience and divine worship. And though perfect love, which is serving God purely out of love, like that higher knowledge, is to be man's destiny in heaven, yet the soul may attain some of it on earth, and endeavor to serve God out of love and not from fear, as thereby she will have an antepast on earth of its union with the Deity, which is to be so rapturous and indissoluble in heaven.

“Yet is the service which arises from fear not to be depreciated, for fear leads to love. it is true that he who obeys God out of love has attained to the highest degree, and already belongs to the saints of the world to come, but it must not be supposed that to worship God out of fear is no worship. Such a service has also its merit, though in this case the union of the soul with the Deity is slight. “There is only one degree which is higher than fear: it is love. In love is the mystery of the divine unity. It is love which unites the higher and lower degrees together; it elevates everything to that position where everything must be one. This is also the mystery of the words, 'Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one God.'" (Sohar, ii, 216a)

Next from this same book we read this on page 500: “New Platonics or Ammonians: So called from Ammonius Saccas, who taught with the highest applause in the Alexandrian school, about the conclusion of the second century. This learned man attempted a general reconciliation of all sects, whether philosophical or religious. He maintained that the great principals of all philosophical and religious truth were to be found equally in all sects, and that they differed from each other only in their method of expressing them...Ammonius supposed that true philosophy derived its origin and its consistence from the Eastern nations, that it was taught to the Egyptians by Hermes, that it was brought from them to the Greeks, and preserved in its original parity by Plato, who was the best interpreter of Hermes and the other Oriental sages. He maintained all the different religions which prevailed in the

world ere, in their original integrity, conformable to this ancient philosophy; but it unfortunately happened, that the symbols and fictions under which, according to the ancient manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and doctrines, were in process of the time erroneously understood, by priests and people...Taking these principles for granted, Ammonius associated the sentiments of the Egyptians with the doctrines of Plato; and to finish this conciliatory scheme, he so interpreted the doctrines of the other philosophical and religious sects, by art, invention, and allegory, that they seemed to bare some semblance to the Egyptian and Platonic systems..."

We get more on this topic from the "Collier's Encyclopedia,"© 1981, volume 2, pages 373-375. This time we see a Catholic priest bringing into that church the very same thing which the Protestants continue to this very day. This quotation will be excerpts from their article about "St. Thomas Aquinas": "From the earliest days of his teaching it became apparent to his contemporaries that he was laying the foundations of a veritable revolution in theology and philosophy...His meeting at Orvieto with his fellow Dominican, William of Moerbeke, led to William's translation of the writings of Aristotle from Greek originals and to Thomas' series of commentaries, in which there is a careful effort to arrive at Aristotle's essential teachings... "Summary, Thomas broke sharply from the so-called Augustinian tradition, which was essentially a form of Neo-Platonism, albeit a Platonism in which many Aristotelean notions had found a place. His work represents the renewal of Christian thought in the light of a metaphysic and theology whose conceptual systematization was expressed in terms of the principles of Aristotle...Perhaps the most fundamental change made by him was his extension of Aristotle's doctrine of potency and act to the relation between an essence and the act of existing which actualized it...His philosophical indebtedness to Aristotle should not be minimized. One has only to read his theological works to realize the esteem in which he held the philosopher..."

We find even more in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 11, pages 664-665, concerning "Hermeneutics": "...He (Hillel) was

also the first to formulate definite rules by which the rabbinical development of the law should proceed. These canons of interpretation were seven in number, afterwards increased by rabbi Ishmael to thirteen by the addition of seven new rules and the omission of the sixth, and looked to the construction of Biblical warrant for precepts which it was wished to prove implicit in the law...This regard for it, which was never wholly disowned, ultimately took shape in the improved rabbinical hermeneutics of the Middle Ages. In the writings of such rabbis as Saadiah Gaon, Jarchi, Fashi, Kimchi, Maimonides, Abarbanel (a line of expositors extending from the 10th to the 16th century, we find, alongside the traditional rules and explanations, a scientific recognition of the interpreter's duty to give the literal sense as well as a practical application of the principles of grammatical and historical exegesis to the Old Testament ...The hermeneutics developed among the Hellenistic Jews had marked characteristics of its own.

"These interpreters, departing from the exclusiveness of rabbinical devotion to the Old Testament revelation, and from the pure Hebraism of native Jews, brought to the study of the sacred books a range of ideas derived from Hellenic culture. They had to devise a hermeneutical procedure which would harmonize their new ethnic learning with the traditional estimate of the Jewish Scriptures. To the theosophic Hellenist, and specially to the Alexandrian Jew, acceptance of the plain sense was often an impossibility. A reconciliation was sought by the use of allegorical interpretation. This method was also pursued by the Rabbinical exegetes. It is embraced in the Halachic hermeneutics, and is seen in the distinctions drawn by Palestinian Jews between the body and the soul of the text... "The coryphæus in this hermeneutical practice was Philo (born perhaps about 20 B.C.), although he had predecessors in Aristobulus (180 B.C.), Josephus, and others. He devoted himself mainly to the exposition of the Pentateuch with the view of explaining the realism and anthropomorphism of the Old Testament in a way to suit the philosophy of the time. Wishful to retain the Alexandrian Jew's regard for Moses as the supremely inspired prophet of God and the oracle of all mysteries along with adherence to the current Platonism and theosophy, he supposed that the

Mosaic writings contained a twofold mode of teaching, a popular representation of God and divine things and was given in the rabbinical hermeneutics by the Kabbalists of the Middle Ages, who used the devices of artificial interpretation in order to find an Old Testament basis for their mixed Neo-Platonist, Gnostic and Sabæans...By the combinations and permutations of letters, the interchange of words of equal numerical value and similar artifices, **NEW MEANINGS WERE EXTRACTED** where the proper sense seemed poor, and acceptable meanings found **WHERE OFFENCE WAS FELT...**"

We will now see more on how the "Jewish" Kabbalah fits into this thing from "Encyclopedia Britannica," Ninth Edition, 1894, volume 13, page 822: "To obtain these heavenly mysteries, which alone make the Torah superior to profane codes, definite hermeneutical rules are employed, of which the following are the most important. (1) The words of several verses in the Hebrew Scriptures which are regarded as containing a recondite (hard to understand) sense are placed over each other, and the letters are formed into new words by reading them vertically. (2) The words of the text are arranged in squares in such a manner as to be read either vertically or boustrophedon 9alternately from right to left and from left to right). (3) The words are joined together and redivided. (4) The initial and final letters of several words are formed into separate words. (5) Every letter of a word is reduced to its numerical value, and the word is explained by another of the same quantity. (6) Every letter of a word is taken to be the initial or abbreviation of a word. (7) The twenty-two letters of the alphabet are divided into two halves; one half placed above the other; and the two letters which thus become associated are interchanged. By this permutation (modification), Aleph, the first letter of the alphabet becomes Lamed, the twelfth letter; Beth becomes Mem, and so on. This cipher alphabet is called Albam, from the first interchangeable pairs. (8) The commutation (back and forth) of the twenty-two letters is effected by the last letter of the alphabet taking the place of the first, the last but one (next to last) the place of the second, and so forth. This cipher is called Atbash. These hermeneutical canons are much older than the Kabbalah. They obtained in

the synagogues from time immemorial, and were used by the Christian fathers in the interpretation of Scripture. Thus Canon V., according to which a word is reduced to its numerical value and interpreted by another word of the same value is recognized in the New Testament...”

Do you fully fathom the significance of what you have just read, for if this is true about “Jewish” hermeneutics and the Kabbalah, they have wrongly interpreted, or even changed some of the meanings of the Hebrew Scriptures with their Chaldean hocus-pocus.

That this is the case is clearly demonstrated in the following:

Deuteronomy 23:7

Have you ever wondered about this verse and its seemingly contradiction to what the rest of the Scriptures say about Edom. Well many of us have. As we have said before there are approximately 27,000 transnational errors in our present Bibles. Some various translations by various translators have attempted to clean up many of these discrepancies, but the errors are very numerous and overwhelming. The translation of Deuteronomy 23:7 is one of them. I will start by quoting this passage: “Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou was a stranger in his land.”

From this verse it would appear that we should welcome all Edomites into our congregations with open arms, and with no questions asked, and that we are somehow guilty of some dire contemptible sin for even thinking an evil thought against them. I ask you: Is this not the impression which seized upon you when you read this passage for the first time?

Remember the guilty, dirty, condemning feeling which overcame you for even giving the Edomites the slightest hint of disparaging thought, that possibly Yahweh might suddenly kill you in your very tracks for even blinking an eye?

If this has been your reaction when reading this passage in the past, forget it, for that is not what this verse is saying; not even remotely. I happened upon this verse many years ago when I was listening to a presentation by an Identity speaker who was making reference to the Edomites by using this verse as one of his points. At the time, I decided to look into the Hebrew meaning of the word “Edomite” for myself. I found the Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible,” assigned the term “Edomite” the Hebrew word “130 which says: “130...Edômîy...Edôwmîy, ed-o-mee’: patronymic [derived from father’s name] from #123; an Edomite, or descendant from (or inhabitant of) Edom: Edomite. See #726 Which had the following to say: #726 ... Arôwmîy, ar-o-mee’; A CLERICAL ERROR FOR #130; an Edomite (as in the margin): Syrian.

At once the truth struck me (and this was about 15 years ago), for if the proper rendering was “Syrian” instead of “Edomite,” it would make all the difference in the world. Over the years, since that time, I have pointed this clerical error out to many people of our persuasion. At the time, I knew this made more sense if Deuteronomy 23:7 were to correctly read “Syrian” rather than “Edomite” for the Syrians were Abraham’s relatives, in which case this verse would read: “Thou shalt not abhor a SYRIAN: for he is thy brother, thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land.” Over the years, we have been satisfied that the word should have been Syrian instead of Edomite. We remember one party who challenged me, indicating that it was only a clerical error, and really didn’t mean anything. I finally came to the conclusion that it would be a hard proposition to prove and decided not to push the point openly any further.

That is, however, until recently, when I was preparing for this lesson, I accidentally discovered what the CLERICAL ERROR was. I will now reveal to you how I made this discovery. As I had decided to take up the topic of Esau, I was in the process of reading anything and everything I could find on the subject. I was reading along in “The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible,” volume E-J, page 24, under the subtitle Edom, when I read this: “...there are

places where, because of the similarity between the letters (d) and (r), the text has wrongly read À, 'Aram' (i.e. Syria), and À, 'Arameans" (i.e., Syrians), for À, 'Edom,' and À, 'Edomites,' such as 2 Kings 16:6; 2 Chronicles 20:2, where the KJV has followed the MT, but the RSV has followed an emended text.

"Note: I have followed the Hebrew characters as faithfully as I know how to do on my computer; I may have made a mistake...The main thing to notice here is the 'similarity between the letters (d) and (r). You can see very readily, that a very small slip of the pen can change the word from Edomite to Samian, or Syrian to Edomite. I will enlarge these two Hebrew letters and place them side by side so you can observe the difference in them:

—

With this very small change in the Hebrew writing, and the word can be changed from Syrian to Edomite! Think of it this way, syRian or eDomite. By this above slight change, the Hebrew 'r' sound is changed to a 'd' sound. Since I originally wrote this, I now realize that the small remnant of Judah from Jerusalem who went into Babylonian captivity spoke Hebrew when they went in and spoke Chaldee when they came out seventy years later.

Also, when they went in they were using a rounded style of Hebrew to write in, and when they came out they were using a square style of Hebrew. Is it possible that the changing from a rounded style to a square style produced such an error? Well, if it did, how many other mistakes are there because of this? After all, it is absurd to believe we should not "abhor an Edomite" when the Almighty hates them Himself.

"And I HATED ESAU, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the LORD of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, THE PEOPLE AGAINST WHOM THE LORD HATH INDIGNATION FOR EVER." (Malachi 1:3-4)

“And Edom said unto him, Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword...And he (Edom) said, Thou shalt not go through. And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border: wherefore Israel turned away from him.” (Numbers 20:18-21)

Edomites

[EE dum ites] descendants of Edom, or ESAU; an ancient people who were enemies of the Israelites. During the days of Abraham, the region which later became the home of the Edomites was occupied by more than one tribe of non-Israelite peoples. When Esau moved to this region with his family and possessions, the HORITES already lived in the land Genesis 36:20. Edom and Israel after Kadesh Barnea. After the years of wilderness wandering, Moses wanted to lead Israel northward to Canaan across Edom into Moab. The king of Edom, however, refused them passage (Numbers 20:14-21), forcing them to bypass Edom and Moab through the desert to the east (Judges 11:17-18. Later in the journey northward to Abel Acacia Grove in the plains of Moab across from Jericho (Numbers 33:48-49), Balaam prophesied that Israel would one day possess Edom. (Numbers 24:18).

From the Conquest Until the Division. In dividing the land of Canaan after the conquest, Joshua established Judah's border to the west of the Dead Sea and to the border of Edom (Joshua 15:1,21). During the reign of Saul, Israel fought against Edom (1 Samuel 14:47). But Edomites at times served in Saul's army (1 Samuel 21:7; 22:9).

David conquered Edom, along with a number of other adjacent countries, and stationed troops in the land (2 Samuel 8:13-14). In later years, Solomon promoted the building of a port on the northern coast of the Red Sea in Edomite territory. He also built a smeltery nearby as a significant part of his developing copper industry. (1 Kings 9:26-29).

After the Division. During the time of the Divided Kingdom, a number of hostile encounters occurred between the nations of Judah or Israel and Edom.

During Jehoshaphat's reign, Edomites raided Judah but were turned back. (2 Chronicles 20:1, 8). An attempt to reopen the port at Ezion Geber failed (1 Kings 22:48); and the Edomites joined forces with those of Judah in Jehoshaphat's move to put down the rebellion of Mesha of Moab. (2 Kings 3:4-5) During the reign of Joram, Edom freed herself of Judah's control (2 Kings 8:20-22), but again came under Judah's control when Amaziah assaulted and captured Sela, their capital city. Edom became a vassal state of Assyria, beginning about 736 B. C.

Edom the Place of the Nabateans. After the downfall of Judah in 586 B. C., Edom rejoiced (Psalm 137:7). Edomites settled in southern Judah as far north as Hebron. Nabateans occupied old Edom beginning in the third century B. C., continuing their civilization well into the first century A. D. During the period from about 400-100 B. C., Judas Maccabeus subdued the Edomites and John Hyrcanus forced them to be circumcised and then made them a part of the Jewish people. The Herod family of New Testament times was of Edomite stock.

Since no written Edomite records have been found, knowledge of the Edomites comes mainly from the Bible, archaeological excavations of their ancient cities, and references to Edom in Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian sources. (from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) (Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

E'DOMITES (e'do-mits). The descendants of Esau, who settled in the S of Palestine and at a later period came into conflict with the Israelites (Deuteronomy 23:7); frequently called merely Edom (Numbers 20:14-21; 24:18; Joshua 15:1; 2 Samuel 8:14); etc.)

Country. Edom ("Idumaea," KJV) was situated at the SE border of Palestine (Judges 11:17; Numbers 34:3) and was properly called the land or mountain

of Seir (Genesis 36:8; 32:3; Joshua 24:4; Ezekiel 35:3, 7, 15). The country lay along the route pursued by the Israelites from Sinai to Kadesh-barnea and thence back again to Elath (Deuteronomy 1:2; 2:1-8), i.e., along the E side of the great valley of Arabah. On the N of Edom lay the territory of Moab, the boundary appearing to have been the "brook Zered." (Deuteronomy 2:13-14, 18).

The physical geography of Edom is somewhat peculiar. Along the western base of the mountain range are low calcareous hills. These are succeeded by lofty masses of igneous rock, chiefly porphyry, over which lies red and variegated sandstone in irregular ridges and abrupt cliffs with deep ravines between.

The latter strata give the mountains their most striking features and remarkable colors. The average elevation of the summit is about two thousand feet above the sea. Along the eastern side runs an almost unbroken limestone ridge, a thousand feet or more higher than the other. This ridge sinks down with an easy slope into the plateau of the Arabian Desert. Although Edom is thus wild, rugged, and almost inaccessible, the deep glens and flat terraces along the mountainsides are covered with rich soil, from which trees, shrubs, and flowers now spring up luxuriantly.

People. The Edomites were descendants of Esau, or Edom, who expelled the original inhabitants, the Horites. (Deuteronomy 2:12) A statement made in Genesis 36:31) serves to fix the period of the dynasty of the eight kings. They "reigned in the land of Edom before any king reigned over the sons of Israel;" i.e., before the time of Moses, who may be regarded as the first virtual king of Israel. (cf. Deuteronomy 33:4-5; Exodus 18:16-19). It would also appear that these kings were elected. The chiefs ("dukes," KJV) of the Edomites are named in (Genesis 36:40-43) and were probably petty chiefs or sheikhs of their several clans.

History. Esau's bitter hatred toward his brother, Jacob, for fraudulently obtaining his blessing appears to have been inherited by his posterity. The Edomites peremptorily refused to permit the Israelites to pass through their land. (Numbers 20:18-21) For a period of 400 years we hear no more of the Edomites. They were then attacked and defeated by Saul. (1 Samuel 14:47) Some forty years later David overthrew their army in the "Valley of Salt," and his general, Joab, following up the victory, destroyed nearly the whole male population (1 Kings 11:15-16) and placed Jewish garrisons in all the strongholds of Edom. (2 Samuel 8:13-14)

Hadad, a member of the royal family of Edom, made his escape with a few followers to Egypt, where he was kindly received by Pharaoh. After the death of David he returned and tried to excite his countrymen to rebellion against Israel, but failing in the attempt he went on to Syria, where he became one of Solomon's greatest enemies. (1 Kings 11:14-22)

In the reign of Jehoshaphat (875 B.C.) the Edomites attempted to invade Israel in conjunction with Ammon and Moab but were miraculously destroyed in the valley of Beracah. (2 Chronicles 20:22, 26) A few years later they revolted against Jehoram, elected a king, and for half a century retained their independence. (2 Chronicles 21:8)

They were then attacked by Amaziah, and Sela, their great stronghold, was captured (2 Kings 4:7; 2 Chronicles 25:11-12) Yet the Israelites were never again able to completely subdue them. (2 Chronicles 28:17)

WHEN NEBUCHADNEZZAR BESIEGED JERUSALEM THE EDMITES JOINED HIM AND TOOK AN ACTIVE PART IN THE PLUNDER OF THE CITY AND slaughter OF THE ISRAELITES. THEIR CRUELTY AT THAT TIME SEEMS TO BE SPECIALLY REFERRED TO IN (Psalm 137). IT WAS ON ACCOUNT OF THESE ACTS OF CRUELTY COMMITTED AGAINST THE ISRAELITES IN THE DAY OF THEIR CALAMITY THAT THE EDMITES WERE SO FEARFULLY DENOUNCED BY THE LATER

PROPHETS. (Isaiah 34:5-8; 63:1-4; Jeremiah 49:17; Lamentations 4:21; Ezekiel 25:13-14; Amos 1:11-12; Obadiah 8-10, 15

On the conquest of Judah, the Edomites, probably in reward for their services during the war, were permitted to settle in southern Palestine and the whole plateau between it and Egypt; but at about the same time they were driven out of Edom proper by the Nabateans.

For more than four centuries they continued to prosper. But during the warlike rule of the Maccabees they were again completely subdued and even forced to conform to Jewish laws and rites and submit to the government of Jewish prefects.

THE EDMITES WERE THEN INCORPORATED INTO THE JEWISH NATION, AND THE WHOLE PROVINCE WAS OFTEN TERMED BY GREEK AND ROMAN WRITERS "IDUMAEA."

Immediately before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, twenty thousand Idumaeans were admitted to the Holy City, which they filled with robbery and bloodshed. From this time the Edomites, as a separate people, disappear from the pages of history. Scriptural indications that they were idolaters (2 Chronicles 25:14-15, 20) are amply confirmed and illuminated by discoveries at Petra. For a discussion of the degrading practices of Edomite religion, see George L. Robinson, *The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization*.

(bibliography: D. N. Freedman and E. F. Campbell, eds., *Biblical Archaeologist Reader* 2 (1964): 51-58; T. C. Vriezen, *Oudtestament Studien* 14 (1965): 330-53; N. Glueck, *The Other Side of Jordan* (1970); D. J. Wiseman, ed., *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (1973), pp. 229-58). (from *New Unger's Bible Dictionary*) (originally published by Moody Press of Chicago, Illinois. Copyright (C) 1988.)

Not only that, but some of the early Church fathers may have followed this system of interpretation to a small degree. Is it any wonder, then, that we

have occasional difficult and questionable Bible passages to deal with. With some passages, we then have to wonder whether what we are reading is “Yahweh breathed” or is some “lying divination” by a “false scribe,” (Ezekiel 13:6; Jeremiah 14:14; Zechariah 10:2?) We are instructed in Scripture to verify everything with witnesses, so when we encounter a difficult passage, we need to consider the CONTEXT in which it is written. When we consider what we know today as so-called “Christianity,” learning that it is an admixture of Aristotelian logic, “Jewish” hermeneutics, Greek philosophy, Persian Magianism, Judaism, Platoism, Gnosticism, Eastern Mysticism, Spinozism, Maimonides-ism and Kabbalism, what should we make of all this? Do you now comprehend why we must do as our Messiah taught, and start all over from the beginning? The Scriptures truly describe our “righteousness as filthy rags.” (Isaiah 64:6)

Beth’lehem. 1. One of the oldest towns in Palestine, already in existence at the time of Jacob’s return to the country. Its earliest name was Ephrath or Ephratah (see Genesis 35:16, 19; 48:7), and it is not till long after the occupation of the country by the Israelites that we meet with it under its new name of Behlehem. After the conquest Bethlehem appears under its own name Bethlehem-judah. (Judges 17:7; 1 Samuel 17:12; Ruth 1:2-2) The Book of Ruth is a page from the domestic history of Bethlehem: the names, almost the very persons, of the Bethlehemites are there brought before us; we are allowed to assist at their most peculiar customs, and to witness the very springs of those events which have conferred immortality on the name of the place. The elevation of David to the kingdom does not appear to have affected the fortunes of his native town. The few remaining casual notices of Bethlehem in the Old Testament may be quickly enumerated. It was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 11:6) By the time of the captivity, the Inn of Chimhaim by Bethlehem appears to have become the recognized point of departure for travelers to Egypt. (Jeremiah 41:17) In the New Testament Bethlehem retains its distinctive title of Bethlehem-judah (Matthew 2:1, 5), and once, in the announcement of the Angels, the “city of David.” (Luke 2:4; comp. John 7:42)...2. A town in the portion of Zebulun named now here but in

Joshua 14:15. (Dictionary of the Bible, p.85, Edited by William Smith, LL.D., Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 13 Astor Place)

Therefore, it would appear that Pastor Buddy is basing his entire supposition upon this last one from the Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia. Yet all the others mentioned say that Bethlehem and Ephrathah are one and the same place. In our opinion Pastor Buddy is in error in his teaching on this particular issue.

Matthew 6:22-23 says: "The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine EYE BE SINGLE, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness."

This is comparable to a person who, learning the true Identity Message, keeps one eye looking back to the Aristotelian philosophized, Gnosticized, Judaized, Kabbalahized, and Eastern mysticized corrupted form of "Christianity." We cannot live in both of these worlds at the same time, for a mind that is divided (affected with double vision) is in total darkness. The Bible tells us further, James 1:8: "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." It is not speaking of the physical eye, but the eye of the mind. Just because your Judeo-Christian preacher may be blinded by his seminary training, that is no reason you need to be blinded also. Not only is our eye to be single, but if we have two eyes (eyes of the mind; one seeing true light and one seeing evil wisdom), we are to pluck out the one seeing evil, Matthew 5:29: "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into the grave." (Heb. Gehenna, as opposed to Abyss, "pit." Also, see Matthew 18:8-9; Mark 9:43-47; Zechariah 11:17)

The result of having two eyes is to have two masters, and being a slave to both. In that way, a man will not amount to much for either. Men might work for two employers, but no slave can be the property of two owners; one is

either in Yahweh's employ or in Satan's. If the mind's eye be full of Greek philosophy, Persian Magianism, Judaism, Platonism, Gnosticism, Eastern Mysticism, Spinozism, Maimonides-ism and Kabbalism like those who are taught in seminaries, what good are they to the Almighty? We are fully persuaded that this "ONE SEED" ONLY TEACHING is coming from students trained in seminaries or by people under their influence. Manly P. Hall in his "An Encyclopedic Masonic, Hermetic, Qabbalistic and Rosicrucian Symbolical Philosophy," p. CXIV, shows that Hermetiism is considered synonymous with Qabbalism and that the tenets of Hermeticism are interwoven with Qabbalism: "The theories of Qabbalism are inextricably interwoven with the tenets of alchemy, Hermeticism, Rosicrucanism and Freemasonry. The words Qabbalism and Hermeticism are now considered as synonymous terms covering all the arcana and exotericism of antiquity. The simple Qabbalism of the first centuries of the Christian Era gradually evolved into an elaborate theological system, which became so involved that it was next to impossible to comprehend its dogma." (With all this, one can now better understand 1 Corinthians 1:19-31 and Romans 1:21)

Because of a misinterpretation of Genesis 3:15, many wrongly apply this passage to a war between the "spirit" against the "flesh." While it is true there is a personal struggle between the spirit (carnal mind) and the flesh, this Scripture does not refer to that type of conflict. The WAR in Genesis 3:15 is a "hate" WAR. It is totally preposterous, therefore, to try to apply Genesis 3:15 to Ephesians 2:15 or Romans 8. The "enmity" in Ephesians refers to something quite different. Actually, Genesis 3:15 speaks about two "hate groups" (a good "hate" group and a bad "hate" group). You probably have been told that only bad people "hate," and that simply is not true. These two "hate groups" are at WAR with each other, and this WAR is not going to be over until one or the other is totally crushed, and you can mark that one down for posterity, our posterity.

"One Seedline" an Antichrist Doctrine

This is a very serious charge, yet it is true, as you will shortly see. Maybe it would be well if the term “one seedline” were defined. It might be called “non-seedline” or “anti-seedline” depending to what extreme it might be taken. If it is taken to the extreme of reducing the “two seeds” of Genesis 3:15 to be the “flesh” and “spirit,” as Ted R. Weiland did, then it would have to be defined as “anti-seedline.” When this extreme position is taken, then even the “seed” of the Messiah is denied. Truthfully, this stance would have to be defined as “anti-seedline,” making their position not only “anti-seedline,” but also “antichrist.” We will now demonstrate why this is so.

When we first started researching Two Seedline, and realizing how serious were the ramifications; also observing those who rejected this teaching, it did not occur to us that such a teaching might be “antichrist.” by delving into the position of the “one seedliners,” the thought that it could be “antichrist” gradually dawned on us, along with the realization that the subject of the two “seeds” of Genesis 3:15 is even more serious than we formerly considered. Let us put it this way. There are certain basic, fundamental tenets to our “Christian” faith.

Those beliefs are as follows: We believe that Yahweh created all things, visible and invisible; that He **BECAME FLESH** and dwelt among us, and that He was of one substance being both man and Yahweh when He took on that flesh; that He suffered and died **IN THE FLESH** at the hands of unholy men; that He rose again **IN THE FLESH** (John 2:19-21), that He ascended into Heaven **IN THE FLESH**; that from thence He will return **IN THE FLESH** to judge both the living and the dead. Every one of these tenets is essential and indispensable to the Christian faith. Consequently, anyone denying these fleshly manifestations of Yahweh is “antichrist.” “And every spirit that confesseth not that Christ (Yahshua) is come in the flesh is not of Yahweh: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.”

The denial of the TWO “seeds” mentioned in Genesis 3:q5 is just as wicked, for if there were no “seed” of the serpent to bruise the hell of Messiah (betrayal and Crucifixion), we would have no Redemption. If He was not bruised for our iniquities, we have nothing to look forward to except the grave. It is blasphemous to even infer He was not bruised, and yet that is what the one seedliners, i.e., anti-seedliners, insist on doing. It is every bit as blasphemous to say that the Word was not made flesh as it is to imply that He was not bruised, yet the anti-seedliners position boils down to just that. To spurn “Two Seedline” is to reject Isaiah 53:5: “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.”

To deny “Two Seedline” is to reject the “bruising” of our Redeemer, for it was the “seed” of the serpent that was to bruise Him. Judas Iscariot was of that “seedline.” If there was no “seed of the serpent” to bruise Him, we have no Redemption. In short, it’s an antichrist religion. And they should be ashamed. Again: If there’s no “seed” of the serpent, there was no bruising. If there was no bruising, there’s no Redemption. Therefore, we will repeat again, the one seedliners and anti-seedliners (or whatever you wish to call them) are teaching an “antichrist” (anti-Messiah) doctrine by denying “Two Seedline.” There are those who advocate that we Two Seedliners declare a truce with the one seedliners. I.e., anti-seedliners, for the good of the Identity Message. To that we reply: **SHOULD WE ALSO MAKE A TRUCE WITH THOSE WHO DECLARE YAHWEH DID NOT COME IN THE FLESH? DO WE MAKE A TRUCE WITH THE JEWS, WHO MURDERED YEASHUA OUR SAVIOR, REDEEMER, AND KING?** Well we don’t know about you, but we will never declare a truce with them and if the Identity Message falls on the Two Seedline teaching then it needs to fall.

Three Doctrines Stand or Fall Together

While there are several doctrines taught in Genesis 3:15, three of these stand or fall together. These three fundamental doctrines are the Incarnation, the

Crucifixion and the Resurrection of our Messiah. They are mutually interdependent. Each one is equal in importance and cannot be separated from the other two. Since both the “bruising” (betrayal and crucifixion) and the “birth” of Yeashua (Yahweh coming in the flesh) are prophesied in Genesis 3:15, they stand or fall together. Therefore, we repeat, these three tenets in Genesis 3:15 stand or fall together. Without the incarnation there could be no “bruising;” without the “bruising” there could be no significance to the crucifixion or the Resurrection.

Remove one element and we have nothing, zip, zero. Therefore, Genesis 3:15 incorporates the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection all in one verse. Why else would Yahweh be so careful about preserving Cain and his posterity (Genesis 4:15, 23-24) if it wasn't to prevent the Serpent's seed from being exterminated before the fulfillment of Genesis 3:15? In order for Yahweh to keep His promise, the **SERPENT'S SEEDLINE** had to be preserved as well as **THE WOMAN'S**.

Genesis 3:15 is also somewhat unique inasmuch as it speaks both generally and specifically. It speaks generally of a “hate” WAR between two genetic groups of people; it speaks specifically of an individual “bruiser” (betrayal) from the one group and an individual Redeemer from the other. Among other things, Genesis 3:15 predicts the outcome of this seemingly unending war. While there are many conflicts in this war between the two “seeds,” there are two specific significant events; the “bruising of the heel” and the “bruising of the head.” The blow to the heel of our sinless Messiah was only temporary as He rose again. The blow to the head of the serpent and his seed will be fatal and final to all belonging to that genetic line, and those who are helping them in their efforts to destroy the White Race.

Resurrection is implied in Genesis 3:15 because the blow to the “heel” was not fatal to the Messiah. Again, we repeat, the incarnation, crucifixion and the Resurrection cannot be taught separately. We either have **ALL THREE** or we have **NONE**. To teach just one or two of these three elements alone is

nonsense and heresy. This is, in essence, what the one seedliners, i.e., anti-seedliners, are doing. What it all boils down to is: If one cannot understand the full implications of Genesis 3:15, one cannot comprehend the rest of the Bible.

It is obvious, then, that the one seedliners with some of their irrational statements on that verse, do not fathom the implications of that crucial and pivotal passage. With the prophecy that the serpent's seed (power) would be totally crushed, no wonder they are sensitive to the word "genocide" and create so-called "hate" laws. No wonder they cry "never again." It would seem that deep within their satanic spirit they are already aware of their final fate. (See the following verses, for they all speak of the total destruction of the Jews: Deuteronomy 28:1-14; 32:39-43; Judges 5:31; Job 11:20; 18:5-21; 21:17-21; 21:30; 31:4; Psalm 1:1-6; 9:5-6; 9:16-17; 11:5-6; 31:17-18; 34:21; 37:8-22; 37:34-38; 50:16-21; 58:10; 68:1-2; 74:22-23; 75:10; 92:7-11; 101:7-8; 104:35; 106:18; 112:10; 139:19-22; 145:20; Proverbs 1:22-32; 2:22; 5:22-23; 10:30; 11:5-7; 13:9; 21:7; 24:20; 2 Esdras 13:9-11; Barnabas 12:9; Ecclesiastes 8:10; Isaiah 1:24; 11:4; 14:1-30; 34:5-8; 65:12-15; 34:4-10; Jeremiah 6:26-30; 8:10-13; 49:7-18; Ezekiel 5:11-17; 25:1-14; 35:1-15; 36:1-5; Obadiah 1:1-21; Zephaniah 1:3-6; 14:21; Malachi 1:3; 4:1; 5:9; Matthew 3:12; 12:39; 13:24-30; 13:36-42; 13:47-50; 17:17; 21:41; 21:41; 22:44; 23:15; Mark 4:11-12; 12:36; Luke 19:14; 19:27; 9:41; John 5:28-29; 15:6; 19:13-15; 2 Thessalonians 2:8-9; 2:9-12; Jude 1:1-12)

Definition of "Antichrist"

You can search in almost any Bible commentary and dictionary and the definition for the term "antichrist" is pretty much universally given as one who denies Yahweh came in the flesh. If this is a proper definition, then it follows that according to the "anti-seedliner's" position., He also was not "bruised by the seed of the serpent" (betrayal and crucifixion), nor did He rise from the dead after three days.

This denial of a literal “seed” of the serpent, propounded by the one seedliners, forces the same conclusion as that defined as “antichrist,” putting them in the same category (that they claim being; there never existed a literal “seed of the serpent” the one seedliners also become guilty of claiming that Yahweh did not come in the flesh. While some commentaries point to the Gnostics of that day as being the “antichrists,” other commentaries point to the “Jews.” Actually, there were “Jewish” Gnostic groups, so both are probably true.

Over the last approximately 2000 years the “Jews” have pretty much fulfilled this definition as being “antichrist.” If, then, the one seedliners want to take the same position as the “Jews,” let them be “marked” for what they really are. Since John Wilson and Edward Hine first brought us the Israel Identity Message, we must pass through a refining process to clear away some false presuppositions; claiming today’s “Jews” as a part of True Israel being one of them. With the teachings of men like Bill Gale, Bertrand L. Comparet, Wesley A. Swift and San Jacinto Capt, the “Jews” instead have been more properly identified as Israel’s formidable and time immemorial enemy. We admit that before knowing anything about the Israel Identity Message and the Two Seedlines of Genesis 3:15, we too, were ignorantly holding this same “antichrist” view herein described as “one seedline,” and didn’t know any better, as that’s all they ever taught in the Judeo-Christian churches that we attended until that time.

We should point out here that we owe a debt of deep gratitude to British Israel. While doing so, though, there are some areas in which we cannot agree: (1) We cannot take the position that the great German people are Assyrians as they are truly of the Tribe of Judah; (2) We cannot agree with British Israel that the Cainites “Jews” are under the Covenant of our fathers; (3) As British Israel is ignorant of Two Seedline, we cannot agree with that either; and, (This is added by me, just so it is clear) (4) That England is Ephraim, and the United States as Manasseh, as we believe that the United States is Ephraim, and England is Manasseh.

The one thing that we learned when getting into this Israel Identity Message is that it was necessary for us to unlearn many things that we thought we knew, and start all over from scratch. This is what a lot of people getting into this Message refuse to do. Paul, after his conversion, had to go to the desert for three years to be reeducated. (Galatians 1:17-18) Three years would have been a reasonable amount of time for him to have reviewed all the Scriptures of the Old Testament (available to him at the time) in a new light. Why should we be any different than Paul? The problem is this Identity Movement is there are a lot of people who haven't been to the desert yet (Identity Pastors not excepted)

Let us read some commentary to help grasp the implications concerning what is considered "antichrist." There are a lot of opinions along this line, but we will concentrate on the definition of denying that Yahweh came in the flesh to dwell among us, and read the other three passages on this as found in 1st John: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." (1 John 2:18); "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Yeashua is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the son." (1 John 2:22); "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Yeashua the Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." (2 John 1:7)

The "Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible," volume 1, page 179, says the following on the subject of Antichrist, under "references in Scripture": "...First John 2:22 defines antichrist as one who 'denies that Jesus is the Christ.' Such a one also 'denies the Father and the Son.' According to John's definition, an antichrist is anyone who denies that Jesus is God and Christ. In 1 John 4:3, reference is made to 'the spirit of antichrist' which again is described as coming in the future and also 'not it is in the world already.' In this passage, also, an antichrist is defined as one who is a denier of the deity of Jesus Christ.

“In 2 John 7, a more specific reference is made to contemporary rejection of Christ by those who deny the reality of the Incarnation: ‘For many deceivers have gone out into the world, men who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist.’ John is anticipating docetism, the view that Christ merely appeared to be in the flesh and was not actually Incarnate. From these four passages it is clear that antichrist, according to John’s definition, is a theological concept primarily and relates to rejection of Christ OR HERETICAL VIEWS CONCERNING HIS PERSON.”

“The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible, volume A-D, page 142 says this concerning “antichrist”: “... Polycarp, however, is in agreement with the Johannie letters that the Antichrist is the SPIRIT of HERESY, that everyone who denies the actual incarnation, is in fact, an antichrist, and that he who denies the RESURRECTION and JUDGMENT is the first-born of Satan.” (Polyc. Philippians 7:1)

From “The Dictionary of the New Testament,” by Hastings, “The Apostolic Church,” volume 3, under the topic “Antichrist” we find some interesting information. While Hastings uses the words “Jewish” for Israelite and Judaism for the beliefs of the Israelites, he has some interesting statements to contribute to our enlightenment on this subject. Interestingly, Hastings connects the subject of “antichrist” with the Temptation in Genesis 3. Thus, there seems to be a close affinity of Two Seedline doctrine with the subject of “antichrist.”

Reading excerpts now from 67-68: “...Although the word ‘Antichrist’ does not occur till we come to the Johannie Epistles, we have many evidences in the pre-Christian Jewish (should be Israelite) literature, canonical and extra-canonical, that there was a widely spread idea of a supreme adversary who should rise up against god, His Kingdom and people, or His Messiah. The strands that went to the composition of the idea were various and strangely interwoven, and much obscurity still hangs over the subject...Traces of this

dragon-myth appear here and there in the Old Testament, e.g., in the story of the Temptation in Genesis 3, where, as in Revelation 12:9; 20:2, the serpent = the dragon; and in the later apocalyptic literature a dragon represents the hostile powers that rise up in opposition to God and His Kingdom (Pss. Sol. 2:29) But it was a characteristic of the forward look of Prophetism and Messianism (prophets and Messiah) that the idea of a conflict between God (Yahweh) and the dragon was transferred from cosmogony to eschatology and represented as a culminating episode of the last days. (Isaiah 27:1; Daniel 7)...Side by side with the dragon-myth must be set the Beliar (Belial) conception, a contribution to Jewish (should be Israelite) thought from the side of Persian dualism, with its idea of an adversary in whom is embodied not merely, as in the Babylonian Creation-story, the natural forces of chaos and darkness, but all the hostile powers of moral evil... "And in the interval between the Old Testament and New Testament Beliar is frequently used as a synonym for Satan, and Devil or arch-demon. (e.g., Jubilees, 15; cf. 2 Corinthians 6:15) The Beliar idea was a much later influence than the dragon-myth, for Babylonian religion offers no real parallel to a belief in the Devil, and Cheyne's suggested derivation of the name from Belili, the goddess of the underworld...has little to recommend it. But a subsequent fusion of Beliar with the dragon was very natural, and we have a striking illustration of it when in Wisdom 2:24 and elsewhere the serpent of the Temptation is identified with the Devil. Cf. Revelation 12:9; 20:2, where 'the dragon, the old serpent,' is explained to be 'the Devil and Satan'...But, so far as the New Testament is concerned, the earlier Antichrist tradition is taken over with important changes, due to the differences between Judaism (correct this time) and Christianity, and especially to the differences in their conception of the Messiah Himself.

"At the same time it must be noted that nothing like a single consistent presentation of the Antichrist idea is given by the New Testament as a whole. Elements of the conception appear in the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Apocalypse, the Johannie Epistles, but in each group of writings it is treated differently and with more or less divergence from the earlier Jewish (Israelite)

forms...In the Synoptic Gospels it is everywhere apparent that Jesus recognized the existence of the kingdom of evil under the control of a supreme personality, variously called the Devil (Matthew 4:1; 13:29, etc.) Satan (Matthew 4:10; 12:26; Luke 10:18 etc.), or Beelzebub (Matthew 12:24), who sought to interfere with His own Messianic mission (Matthew 4:1-11; 16:23), and whose works He had come to destroy (Hebrews 2:14)..."

With this quotation on the subject of "antichrist" we should be beginning to get a conception of what this whole thing is all about. In order to delve into this matter a little further, let's consider the term "Belial." For this we will quote again from the same volume in Hastings, page 140: "BELIAL...Taking the meaning 'worthlessness,' we note that the ordinary use of 'Belial' in the Old Testament suites it very well; 'sons of Belial' or 'men of Belial' means 'worthless or wicked men,' according to the common Hebrew idiom which substitutes a genitive for an adjective.

"The word is, however, twice used in the Old Testament as a quasi-proper name. In Psalm 18:4 we read of 'the cords of death,' 'the floods of Belial,' 'the cords of Sheol,' 'the snares of death'; here Belial = the underworld. Again, in Nahum 1:15 we read that Belial shall no more pass through Judah; he is utterly cut off. In this passage Belial almost exactly corresponds to the 'man of lawlessness, the man of perdition' of Pau (2 Thessalonians 2:3) In the Sibylline Oracles...where the reference to the 'Augustans'...shows the passage to be a later interpolation, probably of 1st cent. A.D....Belial is antichrist...There are many forms of this name, chiefly due to the phonetic interchange of the liquids: Belial, Beliar, Beliam, Belian, Beliab, Belias, Berial."

No we must explain why Nahum 1:15 is speaking of Belial, because that word is not used in the KJV. The verse in the King James reads: "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows: for the wicked shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off."

Therefore, by turning to Strong's Concordance, we can see where Belial comes into play: Strong's Concordance #1100: beliya` al (bel-e-yah'-al); from OT:1097 and OT:3276; without profit, worthlessness; by extension, destruction, wickedness (often in connection with OT:376, OT:802, OT:1121, etc.): KJV - Belial, evil, naughty, ungodly (men), wicked. (Biblesoft's New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary. Copyright (c) 1994, Biblesoft and International Bible Translators, Inc.)

For another definition of "Belial" we will use "The Revell Bible Dictionary," page 143: "Belial...As a proper noun, a name for Satan. In common use, a Hebrew word for 'worthless.' The phrase 'sons of Belial' appears several times in the Old Testament. (Deuteronomy 13:13; 1 Samuel 2:12; 2 Chronicles 13:7) Modern versions usually simply translate this 'worthless persons,' since belia'al means 'worthless' or 'lawless.'

However, the proper name is retained in 2 Chronicles 6:15 where Paul asks rhetorically, 'What harmony is there between Christ and Belial?' In Jewish (Israelite) literature from the second century on Belial (or Beliar) was a name for Satan. In the 2 Corinthians passage Paul urges Christians not to compromise with the ways, the practices, or **THE PEOPLE OF SATAN.** Even the Talmud makes reference to Satan's children: Talmud: "...**CERTAIN SONS OF BELIAL** have gone forth from the midst of thee." (Mas. Berachoth 31b)

Talmud: "...But it is written, sons of Belial?" (Mas. Shabbath 55b)

Talmud: "Mishna. The inhabitants of a seduced city have no portion in the world to come, as it is written, **CERTAIN MEN, THE CHILDREN OF BELIAL,** are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city." (Mas. Sanhedrin 111b)

Talmud: "THE CHILDREN OF BELIAL DENOTES CHILDREN WHO HAVE THROWN OFF THE YOKE OF HEAVEN FROM THEIR NECKS." (Mas. Sanhedrin 111b)

Talmud: "Certain base fellows are gone out." Note 17: Deut. XIII, 14. The lesson is based on the occurrence of the word 'base' (Heb. Belial) in both contexts." (Mas. Baba Bathra 10a)

Then we have the testimony of the Jews that they know that there is no chance of them ever being able to enter into the Kingdom of God: Talmud: MISHNA. The inhabitants of a seduced city have no portion in the world to come, as it is written, CERTAIN MEN, THE CHILDREN OF BELIAL, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city.¹⁸ Footnote, "(18) Deut. XIII, 14. THE DEDUCTION IS FROM, ARE GONE OUT FROM AMONG YOU, IMPLYING THAT THEY HAVE LOST THEIR SHARE IN THE FUTURE WORLD (Rashi and the Yad Ramah). BERTINORO DEDUCES IT FROM THE WORD BELIAL kghkc, WHICH HE READS kgh hkc 'WITHOUT ASCENDING', i.e., WHO WILL NEVER ASCEND FROM THE GRAVE TO THE FUTURE WORLD." (Mas. Sanhedrin 111b)

Again, in "The Revell Bible Dictionary" there is a good definition for the word "antichrist" on page 73: "antichrist An opponent of Christ, or a substitute Christ. The name, coined by John found only in his letters, is rooted in ancient Biblical prophecies concerning an evil person who will appear at history's end to rally mankind against god.

"John also speaks of 'many antichrists,' and of a spirit of antichrist which is active even before the end times. (1John 2;18; 4:3) These antichristian false teachers can be recognized by their denial of Jesus as god in the flesh. Such persons are 'deceivers' who may masquerade as Christians, but whose true character is revealed by their refusal to affirm the full deity of Jesus Christ." We would point out here that to refuse to rightly identify the two "seeds" of Genesis 3:15 is to deny the deity of the Messiah. In order to rightly identify our

Redeemer, it is necessary to profess Him not only as Yahweh in the flesh, but also to identify Him as the One who was “bruised” by the serpent’s seed of Genesis 3:15 for our iniquities.

If He was not bruised as such, He is not Yahweh in the flesh. Further, we must recognize His Resurrection. If He was not bruised (dying in our place). He could not be resurrected. If He did die in our place and resurrect to life again, He is not Yahweh in the flesh. The one seedliners deny His bruising. If He suffered and died a LITERAL physical death, then the serpent is also a LITERAL physical seedline. By teaching against Two Seedline, the one seedliners, i.e., anti-seedliners, have made themselves ANTICHRISTS. And that by their own choice.

The fact that our Israel people are in a WAR with the seedline of Satan should again be emphasized. This WAR started in Genesis 3:15, in the Garden of Eden, and has continued now for over 7000 years. This AR is between two “hate groups”; a good hate group and a bad “hate” group. Some may reply that all “hate” is unchristian, and THAT SIMPLY IS NOT TRUE. On the one side are the literal “children of Satan”; on the other side are the true “Children of Yahweh.” Among the fleshly “children of Yahweh is the Messiah Himself. Therefore, our Redeemer is a member of the good “hate group.”

Once more, He is not ashamed to be counted as a member. (Hebrews 2:11) Hate is on bad when it is focused in the wrong direction. However, if our hate would be properly manifested, it will not affect the innocent. Should we direct our hate where it is needed, some of our problems with our common enemy could be solved.

The one seedliners (anti-seedliners) vent their hatred toward the flesh; the Two Seedliners vent their hatred toward the literal, walking, talking, breathing genetic children of Satan. If our “flesh” is the problem, we had better get our “flesh” out of today’s satanic banking system. Maybe one should cut off his “fleshly” fingers to avoid paying the IRS any illegal income tax, which in turn

supports the murderous abortion of White Children making one an accessory after the fact. According to the anti-seedliners (who teach the flesh is the problem), we should look at those fingers and “hate” them rather than identify the real enemy. Mother of all absurdities.

While speaking of absurdities, we must relate another situation that happened while researching the subject of Two Seedline. About five years ago while writing several small articles on this subject having become aware that there were several distracting critics speaking in opposition to it. Because of the seriousness of the matter, we put these several small papers together entitling them “Research Papers Proving Two Seedline Seduction of Eve.” Later, Ted R. Weiland obtained a copy of these writings and attempted to make a fool of me. I will now relate one of those instances, and you can evaluate the situation for yourself and determine who is really imprudently ill-advised on this topic.

On page 4 of my “Research Papers Proving Two Seedline Seduction of Eve,” I said the following in part: “It is absurd, then, to say the woman doesn’t have any seed. The woman, then, contributes just as much genetic makeup to the offspring as the man. The question at this point is: If the serpent has seed, or “children”; who fathered and mothered them? For this, it is critical that we go first to Genesis 3:13 which say: ‘And Yahweh said unto the , What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, There serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.’ You will notice that Eve told Yahweh, ‘The serpent BEGUILED ME.’ Let’s see what this word ‘BEGUILED’ means in the Strong’s Concordance in Hebrew. It is #5377; ‘nâshâ, naw-shaw’; a primitive root; to lead astray, i.e., (mentally) to delude, or (MORALLY) TO SEDUCE: beguile, deceive, x greatly, x utterly.’

“Her the word beguile can mean seduce, which in turns means, to induce (a women) to surrender her chastity...entice to unlawful sexual intercourse. It can also mean to be mentally seduced, (and I claim one is mentally seduced before the physical act). We have to be wise enough to know the difference.

Now that we have covered the word beguiled, let's not take up the word eat. EAT in the Strong's Concordance is #398, and means: "akal, 'aw-kal; a primitive root, to eat (literally or figuratively): -x at all, burn up, consume, devour (er, up), dine, eat (-er, up), feed (with) food, x freely, x in...wise (-deed, plenty), (LAY) meat, x quite' [x = Hebrew idiom]. In this particular verse eat could mean what it says, but it is better rendered lay. Now that we have consulted with the Strong's Concordance as to the meanings of these two words, let's try to determine what Eve really said: **'THE SERPENT SEDUCED ME, AND I DID LAY.'** At this point you might say that we are stretching the Hebrew meaning of the word eat."

At this point let me interject the following into this discussion: Strong's Concordance #2233 zera' (zeh'-rah); from OT:2232; SEED; figuratively, fruit, plant, sowing-time, posterity: KJV - X carnally, CHILD, fruitful, SEED (-time), sowing time. #2232 zara' (zaw-rah'); a primitive root; to sow; figuratively, to disseminate, plant, fructify: KJV - bear, conceive seed, set with sow (-er), yield. (Biblesoft's New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary. Copyright (c) 1994, Biblesoft and International Bible Translators, Inc.)

The part that Weiland quoted from my work was that part I had taken from the Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible on the Hebrew word #398, akal, plus the sentence before it and the last two sentences after it. Then Weiland commented as follows on pages 24-25: "The seedliners indeed stretch the Hebrew meaning of the word 'eat.' Any linguist would maintain that the Hebrew word 'akal' translated 'eat' has been distorted to say something it does not mean. The word 'lay' is not part of Strong's definition for the Hebrew word 'akal.' The definition is only that word, or group of words, that precede the colon. In the preface to his Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary, Mr. Strong explained that what follows the colon are renderings by the translators of the King James Bible: '6. Finally (after the punctuation-mark:-) are given all the different renderings of the word in the Authorized English Version, arranged in the alphabetical order of the leading terms...'

“Mr. Strong also explains his use of parentheses around the word ‘Lay:’() (parentheses)...denotes a word or syllable sometimes given in connection with the principal word to which it is annexed.’ This is demonstrated in the following passage from Hosea: ‘I (Yahweh) drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love: and I was to them (the house of Israel) as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them. (Hosea 11:4)’ In other words, the word ‘lay’ as used by James Strong is not in any sense a definition or replacement for the word ‘eat’ and cannot be used in the fashion dictated by the previous seedliner.’ Concerning the word ‘beguiled’ in Genesis 3:13, one seedliner (Nord Davis) speculated: ‘When Eve was cross-examined (by Yahweh), she is quoted as admitting: ‘Nachash beguiled (Strong’s word #5377, nasha, sexually seduced) me and I did eat, Genesis 3:13.’ For this seedline author (Nord David) to insert the word ‘sexually’ into Strong’s definition borders on dishonesty. Strong’s Concordance does not say ‘sexually’ seduced.”

Weiland should have mentioned Proverbs 30:20: “Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.” Which proves that the word “eat” means sexual actions. For what other thing could be inferred in speaking of an adulterous woman; for that is what she does have sex with someone else, that is why they call her an adulterous woman.

Since Nord Davis is dead and cannot defend himself, I am compelled to give an answer for him; Nord might instruct Mr. Weiland to check out the “Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament,” for it does say “sexual pleasures” for the Hebrew word #398, akal. There are four meanings for the word akal, and number three says this, page 43: “(3) to enjoy anything, as good fortune, Job 21:25; the fruit of good or evil actions, **SEXUAL PLEASURES.**” (Proverbs 30:20 (cōmp. 9:17...5:20) This meaning can also be verified from “Wilson’s Old Testament Word Studies” under the topic “eat,” page 141.

Also, George M. Lamsa, in his "Idioms In The Bible," points this out concerning Proverbs 9:17 as "stolen love" and "making love to another woman in secret appears pleasant." This is the same word that Eve used when she said, Genesis 3:13: "...The serpent beguiled me, and I did akal." Now, who really is the one "bordering on dishonesty?" such spurious nit-picking arguments about "punctuation marks," "colons" and "parentheses" have little or no bearing in this case. Remember, the statement made about "any linguists" above?" "Any linguist would maintain that the Hebrew word 'akal' translated 'eat' has been distorted to say something it does not mean." Well, in Gesenius a qualified "linguist" or no? From this we can conclude one of two things: either Weiland doesn't have a Gesenius' Lexicon or he has refused to use it. Actually, Weiland's explanation of the components of Strong's definition is correct. His real fault lies in his disdain for idioms. Just like he dismisses the entire Talmud, which contain many of the tenets of Israel Identity, he wants to dismiss all valid idioms in Hebrew.

Weiland should also check Strong's at the front of the "Hebrew And Chaldee Dictionary" under "Signs Employed" concerning idioms, especially under "X." In as much as Weiland frowns on idioms (like in Genesis 49:9 17, 21, 22, 27), by his own standards, we should start searching for the "lost tribes" at the Bronx Zoo.

Not only is Mr. Ted R. Weiland taking these things totally out-of-context, but he makes some of the most blasphemous statements against the Almighty I have ever witnessed in his book "Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?" on pages 4 and 5. Here are some excerpts of his remarks attempting to put his own outlandish contrived words into the Two Seedliner's mouths: "Yahweh, Himself, is a sexual deviant"... "Yahweh had sexual relations with women and fathered children"... "Yahweh is a liar"... "The Bible is untrustworthy"... "Adam was a sodomite"... "Both Adam and Eve were abominations in the eyes of Yahweh"... "Adam and Eve were permitted by Yahweh to have sexual relations with several partners...or people of other races"... "Yahweh was the originator of and even promoted spouse swapping for both heterosexual and

homosexual purposes”...“Yahshua carried the genes of someone of another race”...“All Israelites are the seed of Satan”...“Satan could have and possibly did have sex with some of the Corinthian Christians, both men and women alike”...“Yahshua the Christ had and has sexual relations with His followers.” Now Weiland makes the claim that we Two Seedliners imply these things just quoted. For the life-of-me, I have never read or heard any of the Two Seedliners make any such suggestions. Therefore, those statements belong to Weiland and Weiland alone, and he must bear the responsibility for them. They are his invention and he owns them by copyright, Library of Congress, #00-090494. Weiland, by making these remarks, implies that I personally am making such assertions, for he quotes me several times in that book (and mostly out-of-context).

Weiland not only quoted me, but also many other prominent Two Seedliners. He tries to make it appear he is not pointing his finger and naming names. He does that by placing a number at the end of each quotation and then lists them at the back of his book. Let’s take a look at some of the people, other than myself, who he accuses of such blasphemy on pages 105-115: Dan Gayman, Gladys M. Demaree, Bertrand L. Comparet, Jarah B. Crawford, Nord W. Davis, B.J. Dryburgh, Dewy Tucker, James E. Wise, Scott Stinson, Norman Moody Rogers and Arnold Murry. How dare Weiland try to put blasphemous words like those into our mouths. Not only that, but some of these people are dead and cannot defend themselves, and if they said such blasphemous things, why doesn’t Weiland quote book, chapter and verse? He doesn’t because he can’t.

In His Blindness, Weiland Stumbles Across Some Valuable Information Favoring Two Seedline

Despite Weiland’s dogged, determined pursuit to destroy the Two Seedline Truth, he accidentally happens on some valuable evidence which helps substantiates Eve’s sexual encounter with Satan, though he ridicules it as being “Babylonian-influenced.”

But, before I use this secondhand quote from Weiland's "Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?" concerning that informative data, you will need some background regarding it. According to Weiland's source notes, it was written by Scott Stinson in an article entitled "The Serpent and Eve."

In that article, Stinson speaks of the contents of various Targum. For a very brief explanation of what a Targum is, I will quote from the "New Concise Bible Dictionary," Editor Derek Williams, pages 541-542: "TARGUM: An Aramaic translation or paraphrase of some part of the Old Testament. Targums exist for all Old Testament books except Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel. They came into being as the synagogue evolved after the Exile, when Aramaic began to replace Hebrew as the Jews' language. It therefore became customary for a reading of the Hebrew Scriptures in the synagogue service to be followed by an oral rendering into Aramaic. As time passed, these renderings became more fixed and traditional, and were committed to writings probably from the 2nd cent. B.C.

"Even the most literal Targums brought place-names up to date, smoothed over textual difficulties and clarified obscure passages. Some of the paraphrase Targums expand the text considerably, substantially altering the text and inserting additional material ('midrash'). Their value today is that they offer major evidence for the vernacular speech of ancient Palestine, and hence for the study of New Testament language and background. They also offer an important witness to the Old Testament text."

Among these targumim are the "Targum of Onkelos" and the "Pseudo-Jonathan Targum," among others. Weiland is definitely of the opinion that those targumim were and are "Babylonian-influenced." I would rather believe they were not, for it wasn't until after they came back from the Babylonian exile that the targumim came into being. They were borne out of necessity; not some Babylonian religious system. As the books of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah were not entirely written in Hebrew, there wasn't a need for Aramaic Targums for them. When the exiles returned speaking Aramaic, it

then became necessary to have a translation from the Hebrew into Aramaic. With the Scriptures being read publicly, both in their former Hebrew and in the Aramaic, any variation in the text would have been censured and reprimanded, for they had very stringent rules on how this was done. Scott Stinson points out that the Targums and the Hebrew, as we know it today, do not agree on the Temptation story.

Now, quoting Scott Stinson indirectly from Weiland's book, page 96:

"This (seedline) interpretation is confirmed on the Hebrew Bible written in Aramaic and commonly known as Targums. These commentaries were written after the (House of Judah's) return from Babylon...One text gives this interpretation of Genesis 4:1: 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the Angel of the Lord.' (Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1) Another ancient commentary gives a similar interpretation of the same passage; 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord...' (Palestinian Targum to Genesis 4:1) In another Rabbinic work we find a similar interpretation...: 'And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.' (Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 21) One Rabbinic source states: 'Eve bore Cain from the filth of the serpent, and therefore from him were descended all the wicked generations, and from his side is the abode of spirits and demons.' (Ahare Moth 76b) A similar explanation for the evil deeds of Cain's lineage is found elsewhere. We read: 'For two beings had intercourse with Eve, and she conceived from both and bore two children. Each followed one of the male parents, to this side and one to the other, and similarly their characters. On the side of Cain are all the haunts of the evil species, from which come evil spirits and demons.'" (Bereshith 36b)

The real "Babylonian-influenced words" to which Ted R. Weiland refers is rather the Cabalistic numerology system by which the priesthood of that day till this attach an occult secret meaning to every letter, word, phrase and

sentence of the Old Testament. Reading Targums in public is hardly “secret.” Evidently, Weiland is unaware that the Aramaic Targums affected greatly the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament, which is also considered a Targum.

Obviously, Weiland is also oblivious to the fact that most of the Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament are taken mostly from the Septuagint. By Weiland’s own premise, we are going to have to throw out all of these Old Testament quotations in our New Testament because they are from Aramaic Targums which are supposedly “Babylonian-influenced” Not only that, but when our Savior Himself quoted from the Old Testament, as recorded in Luke 4:17-21, He may have read from a Targum.

If He had read directly from the Hebrew, the people would have demanded an interpreter. What Ted R. Weiland, along with several other one seedliners, attempt to do is condemn everything written in the Talmud, the Cabala, the Zohar, the Targums and other “Jewish” literature as being 100% false, and that we must take a 180° stand in opposition to ANY SUCH INFORMATION. If we were to take such a position, we would have to condemn as well most of the tenets of the Christian Israel Message, for hundreds of references in the Talmud are parallel to Identity beliefs. Therefore, I believe Scott Stinson presented some credible, relevant evidence concerning Genesis 4:1. If his research evidence is correct, then, someone has altered the meaning of Genesis 4:1. I will develop and expand, and elaborate more about the subject of these Targums later. While the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) rant and rave about Two Seedline doctrine being “Babylonian-influenced,” there is a reference on page 8 of “The Wycliff Bible Commentary” concerning Genesis 3:14-15, for which they cannot make that claim: “Cursed (ʿarû) art thou. The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would rather slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who had slandered

God. (cf. Isaiah 65:25) HE WAS TO REPRESENT NOT MERELY THE SERPENT RACE, BUT THE POWER OF THE EVIL KINGDOM. As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him. I WILL PUT ENMITY. The word בא denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man. (cf. Numbers 35:19-20; Ezekiel 25:15-17; 35:5-6) It is the same in both clauses. When translated 'crush,' it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in describing the attack of the serpent on man's heel. It is also rendered 'lie in wait for, aim at or (LXX) watch for.' The vulgate renders it 'conteret, 'bruise' in the first instance and 'insidiaberis,' 'lie in wait,' in the other clause. Thus, we have in this famous passage, called the 'Protevangelium,' 'first gospel,' the announcement of a prolonged struggle, perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of woman. God's promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. This assurance fell upon the ears of God's earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption."

This passage spells it all out except naming the counterfeit Judahites ("Jews") as the "serpent race" and Eve's seed as the Anglo-axon descendants of the Israelites. Truly, the one seedline position is built on error, and therefore to maintain it, it becomes an endless necessary to build on top of it, with one error after another.

The Agenda of the Serpent's Seed

According to some one seedliners (anti-seedliners), the only seed of Genesis 3:15 is exclusively, and only, "Jesus Christ." For the rest of them who assign the seed of that verse to the so-called "seeds of the spirit and the seeds of the flesh," they deny the Messiah Himself. Not only are there children (seed) of the serpent of this "First Gospel," but his seed has an agenda. On a prison list some are taking a college course in Business Administration, and have sent a copy of a page from one of his textbooks on that subject called "Your Future in Business Begins Now," chapter 1, page 11. As you read it you will begin to

see just how serious this WAR of Two Seedlines is, which the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) challenge: “The United States is undergoing a new demographic transition: it is becoming a society composed of people from multiple cultures. Over the next decades, the United States will shift further away from a society dominated by whites and rooted in Western Culture toward a society characterized by three large racial and ethnic minorities: African Americans, U.S. Hispanics, and Asian Americans. All three minorities will grow in size and in share of the population, while the white majority declines as a percentage of the total. Native Americans and people with roots in Australia, the Middle East, the former Soviet Union, and other parts of the world will further enrich the fabric of the U.S. society.

“The labor force of the past was dominated by white men who are retiring. They will be replaced by a multicultural labor force who are beginning their careers in entry-level jobs in 2000. The proportion of workers who are non-Hispanic whites will decrease from 77 percent in 1997 to 74 percent in 2005. A diverse is a healthy workforce. Diversify leads to new ideas, new ways of doing things, and greater income equality among ethnic groups.

“Multiculturalism exists only when all major ethnic groups in an area; such as a city, country, or census tract, are roughly equally represented. Because of the current demographic transition, the trend in the United States is toward greater multiculturalism, although the degree varies in different parts of the country.

“Four of New York City’s five boroughs are among the 10 most ethnically diverse counties in the country. People of various ancestries have long been attracted to San Francisco county, and not surprisingly, it is the most diverse in the nation. The proportions of major ethnic groups are closer to being equal there than anywhere else. The least multicultural region is a broad swath stretching from northern New England through the Midwest and into Montana. These counties have fewer people other than whites. The counties with the

very lowest level of diversity are found in the agricultural heartland; in Nebraska and Iowa.”

Does this agenda sound like a mere “flesh” problem as the anti-seedliners claim? How foolish an assumption. By denying Two Seedline doctrine, and the one seedliners (anti-seedliners) do, they actually help promote that agenda of the seed (children) of the serpent. Although the enemy is crying now for “equality,” in the end, he will demand total annihilation of the Whites. Once he has brought about admixture to the whites, in essence, he has, in effect annihilated them. Therefore, there is only one solution to the problem, and that is the total separation of the Whites from the other races. And unless that is brought about in the near future, we do not have a destiny. Possibly with an understanding of Two Seedline doctrine, we might forestall, completely halt and reverse that forthcoming disaster to our race. If we ever come out of this dilemma, it will be no thanks to those who are fighting the Two Seedline message.

There are some who not only deny that this WAR exists, but deny who the primary players are supplying all of the funds, and those directing it. This WAR started in Genesis 3:15 and the opponents are the “seed” (children) of the serpent and the “seed” (children) of the woman. This is a WAR with no holds barred by either side. This is NOT a WAR where one is to pray for the enemy or try to convert him to “Christianity!” Had many of the “Jews” not been “the seed of the serpent” it wouldn’t have been necessary for our Messiah to have spoken in parables. We are told unequivocally in Matthew 13:10-15 that He spoke in parables to them in order to prevent them from becoming converts.

Shortly after this parable, He likened the “Jews” to “tares” and labeled them “the children of the wicked one.” In Matthew 13:38 the terms “seed” and “children” are used interchangeably as it says “seed are...children.” If one will check the word “children,” #5207, in the New Testament Word Study (on Greek) by Spiros Zodhiates, page 1404, one will find that it means “(A) A male

offspring...(B) In a wider sense it means a descendant, pl. descendants, posterity..." It might have been speaking figuratively had not the word "seed" been used interchangeably with "children." In their quest to deny Two Seedline, the anti0-seedliners deny this Greek meaning. Further, the word "wicked" #4190, in that same verse, according to Zodhiates, page 1198, is used with the definite article "ho," and means: "...THE EVIL ONE, SATAN..." By denying these Greek meanings, the anti-seedliners deny the very words of Messiah Himself.

Additionally, the word "wicked," #4190, is used with the DEFINITE ARTICLE "ho" in Matthew 13:19; Ephesians 6:16; 1 John 1:13-14; 3:12; 5:18, and means "Satan" there also. Thus, in 1 John 3:12 where it says: "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one..." Means exactly what it says, "Satan." The book Synonyms of the New Testament, by Richard Trench confirms what Zodhiates says about the word "wicked" (Greek #4190) on page 330: "Satan is emphatically ho poneros as the first author of all the mischief in the world." In his Greek-English New Testament Lexicon, George Ricker Berry, page 82 describes ho poneros as "...the wicked one, i.e., Satan..." W.E. Vine in his An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words under "wicked" on Matthew 13:38 states: "...and in the following (verse is cited), where Satan is mentioned as 'the (or that) evil one'..." Another way to verify the "wicked" of Matthew 13:38 is speaking of Satan, is to go to Matthew 13:19 where the same Greek word #4190 is used saying: "...then cometh the wicked one..." Then compare the parallel passage in Luke 8:12 which says: "...then cometh the devil..." The conclusion then must be: the "seed" or "children" in Matthew 13:38 planted by the "wicked" one are the genetic offspring of Satan! This parenting of the tares is also spelled out in the Aramaic Targums. (If you listen to the anti-seedliners, they will argue the "wheat and tares" of Matthew 13 are just figurative or spiritual; the same position as the so-called "Jew-deo-unchristian" churches).

Aramaic Targums and Their Context With Genesis 4:1

After years of research on the subject of Two Seedline doctrine, the Aramaic Targums seem to hold the missing ingredient to pull this passage into perspective. Ted R. Weiland, in his booklet "Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?" had all this information in front of him, but he rejected it, claiming it was "Babylonian-influence." (Page 96) this is one of the favorite ploys of the one seedliner (anti-seedliners) in their quest to reject one of the foundational truths of scripture. Being there is evidence of the "Jewish" Masoretic scribes manipulated the Hebrew text by hermeneutics with their Babylonian-cabalistic-mystical-thought-system, we are left with the Aramaic Targums as an alternative witness. A very concise article about Targums from the "Collier's Encyclopaedia," 1980 edition, volume 4, page 127 under the topic "Bible." Like many of the references this quotation is informative, but do not endorse it 100%: "The Aramaic Targums. During the middle of the first millennium B.C., a Syrian language called Aramaic gradually became the dominant commercial and popular tongue throughout the Middle East. As the Jews adopted this language, they forgot their Hebrew and could understand less and less of the scriptures read to them in the synagogue. Eventually, a translator was needed to render the text into Aramaic as it was read out in Hebrew. The translator was known as a *torgeman* and his translation as a *Targum*.

"In time the Aramaic Targum became standardized, and finally it was written down. The earliest written Targum we have is a manuscript of the Book of Job discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran. It was written about the first century B.C., but most of the other surviving Targums were composed later, among the Aramaic-speaking Jews of Babylon. The Aramaic Targums generally paraphrase rather than translate literally. They bring in much explanatory material and homily (sermonizing) reflecting the thought of the time. Many Hebrew Bibles of today still carry the Aramaic Targum side by side with the Hebrew text.

"The Septuagint, or Greek Version: The Greek version of the Old Testament began as a Targum for Jews living in Greek-speaking areas of the Middle

East. There were probably isolated Greek translations of the Hebrew scriptures in circulation before the third century B.C. According to tradition, dissatisfaction developed with the unofficial nature of these translations, and an official version was prepared by a committee of 70 or 72 eminent scholars for the library of King Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) In Alexandria. This translation came to be known as the 'Version of the Seventy,' in Latin, the Septuagint. More probably, the Septuagint represents a revised collation of the informal oral synagogue translations into the Greek.

"Jews at first welcomed the Septuagint, With the rise of Christianity, however, it became primarily associated with the Christian Church. The Jews repudiated it and prepared other Greek translations. **MOST OF THE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT THAT APPEAR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HAVE BEEN MADE FROM THE SEPTUAGINT...**

The Hebrew Text and Textual Criticism

"All original manuscripts of the Old Testament are at present lost. We possess only late copies in Hebrew or in various ancient versions. The Hebrew texts are the product of generations of scribes and are sometimes quite altered and corrupted. Since many errors have crept into the manuscripts, the task of Old Testament textual criticism is to recover, as nearly as possible, the words that were written in the earliest stage of literary preservation.

"Texts of the Sopherim (Scribes): For several centuries the text of the Old Testament books seems to have remained relatively fluid. The scribes of the earthly period (c. 500 B.C., to A.D. 100), known as the Early Sopherim, **ALTERED THE TEXT IN MANY WAYS, THROUGH MISTAKES OF HEARING, READING OR WRITINGS.**

"**WORDS WERE MISSPELLED; DIVISION BETWEEN WORDS WERE WRONGLY MADE; WORDS, LINES, OR ENTIRE PASSAGES WERE OMITTED, REPEATED, OR TRANSPOSED; OBSCURE AND OFFENSIVE**

WORDS WERE 'CORRECTED;' EDITORIAL INTRODUCTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS WERE ADDED: DOUBLE READINGS WERE RECORDED; AND MARGINAL NOTES WERE LATER MISTAKEN FOR PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT AND INSERTED IN THE WRONG SPOTS. All these factors led to highly varied texts..."

From this, we can see that the Septuagint was considered a Targum. Today, many swear by the KJV Targum or the RSV Targum. "Targum" simply means a translation. Also, we gather that most of the Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament were taken from the Septuagint Targum.

By his own personally invented criteria, if Targums are "Babylonian-influenced," as Ted R. Weiland claims, we are going to have to refute all these Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament of our Bibles. Many today make the claim that some of our Bibles are "God-breathed" and without error.

This is entirely true of the original manuscripts, but can hardly apply to later corrupted translations or copies. Can we claim that our translations (Targums) are fully "God-breathed?"

Could Messiah Have Quoted From A Targum?

From the "Collier's Encyclopedia" comment above, it might appear that Targums were not committed to writing until the "Jews" returned to Babylon, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Notice that Collier's says: "surviving Targums." We will not make a case that our Savior, when He quoted Isaiah 61:1 found in Luke 4:16-23 was in all likelihood reading from a Targum. This passage says: "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written. The Spirit of the Lord IS upon me, because he

hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave IT again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.”

If one will consult various commentaries like “Jamieson, Fausset & Brown’s Commentary On The Whole Bible” or “Matthew Poole’s A Commentary On The Holy Bible” it will indicate that this passage is taken from the Septuagint. If you will read that passage again, you will notice that everyone in that synagogue without exception, understood every word the Redeemer was saying. So, whatever the language might have been, we are informed in Matthew 26:73 that there was a noticeable difference in accent between Jerusalem and Galilee.

George M. Lamsa’s Gospel Light, introduction, page 26: “...The Old Testament translation known as the Septuagint, was made into Greek by Jews for Jews who understood neither Aramaic nor Hebrew. **THIS GREEK TEXT OF THE SCRIPTURES WAS NOT USED IN PALESTINE WHERE IT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN UNDERSTOOD AND WHERE THE ORIGINAL TEXTS ARE IN COMMON USE.** It is worth mentioning that the Greek Septuagint was not accepted or used by Eastern Christians. This is so today. The Eastern Version of the Old Testament is the authorized text of Nestorians, Chaldean Roman Catholics, Jacobites and other Christian groups and in its antiquity and originally are strongly supported by all of them regardless of the theological differences. The Septuagint was rejected partly because it contained the books of the Apocrypha which were not included in the Jewish Canon. This question was debated at the Jewish Council of Jamnia in 90 A.D., and settled in favor of the Palestinian decision. It was only after St. Jerome made the Latin Vulgate in the fourth century A.D., that the Apocrypha was accepted as canonical by the Roman Catholic Church.”

We must take into account that Lamsa is biased somewhat toward the Aramaic, as that was the language of his native origin. It would appear the Almighty used the language barrier between the Aramaic and Greek to separate the Gospel message away from the on-Israelite “Jews” toward the “lost sheep of the House of Israel.” The “Jews” continue to this very day to use Aramaic Targums, while Greek was used as a vehicle to spread the Gospel to the true Israelite peoples. But, that is no reason we should reject Aramaic Targums as a viable witness. Also, just because the “Jews” rejected the books of the Apocrypha, is no reason we should reject them also. It is obvious, if we should take time to study them, why they would reject them. We could point out several passages, but that is not the topic before us.

Stringent Rules For Targums

“The Encyclopedia Britannica,” Ninth Edition (1894), volume 23, page 68:
“Former Use of the Targum in Public. The following rules had to be observed in reading of the Scriptures at the synagogal service: I. As regards the Law (Pentateuch). (1) The private person called to the Law (which chiefly contains Halachic matter) read one verse of it, which the official methurgeman or torgeman (translator) immediately paraphrased; (2) whilst the reader of the law was not allowed to take his eye off the written scroll, the methurgeman was forbidden, not merely to read out of a written Targum, but even to look into the sacred text: (3) each of these had to wait till the other had quite finished the reading and translation respectively; (4) one was not allowed to raise his voice in a louder key than the other; (5) a certain number of passages, although allowed to be read, were not allowed to be translated; these were: (a) such as might reflect unfavorably on a father of a tribe, or on an eminent teacher... (b) such as might encourage the ignorant to think that there was some truth in idolatry; (c) such as might offend decency... (d) such as were fixed by the Lord Himself to be read in Hebrew only (as sacerdotal benediction, Numbers 6:24-26); (6) the translator was neither allowed to give a literal translation nor to add anything that had no foundation in the Divine word; he had to give the spirit of the letter.

“II. As regards the Prophets. (1) The person called to read the Prophets (which chiefly contain agamic matter) might read three verses, of which the translator, who might be the reader himself, sought to render the meaning to the best of his ability; (2) the translator was allowed both to read out of a Targum volume and to look also into the book constringing the prophetic texts; (3) if the reader and the translator were two different persons they observed the third rule given above for the case of reading the Law; (4) here also certain passages were not allowed to be translated: (a) such as reflected on great men of the Israelite nation; (b) such as offend decency; (5) any one sufficiently intelligent might read, and of course paraphrase the portion from the Prophets...”

This brings us to a very critical and vitally important cornerstone of all Scripture. The following passages from Aramaic Targums were cited by a Scott Stinson in an article entitled “The Serpent and Eve” in *The Vision*, July 1998, vol. 2, #8, pages 28-29: Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1: “And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain’ and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord...” In another Rabbinic work: *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, 21: “And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.”

It would appear from those references that the problem with Genesis 4:1 is an omission of some of the words of the Hebrew text. Now quoting from the King James Version and adding the potentially needed words in quotation marks from the Targum of Jonathan so it will make some sense: “And Adam knew his wife Eve, ‘who was pregnant by Sammael,’ and she conceived and bare Cain, ‘and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like early beings,’ and she said, I have gotten a man from ‘the angel’ of the Lord.”

Once we become aware there is a discrepancy both in the Massoretic and Septuagint texts as opposed to the Aramaic Targums on Genesis 4:1, certain

comments by various Biblical scholars start to make sense. Many of the best Hebrew scholars confirm there is a problem with Genesis 4:1!

“The Interpreter’s Bible,” a twelve volumes collaborative work of 36 “consulting editors” plus 124 other “contributors” makes the following observation on this verse, vol. 1, page 517: “Cain seems originally to have been the ancestor of the Kenites...The meaning of the name is ‘metalworker’ or ‘smith;’ here, however, it is represented as a derivation of a word meaning ‘acquire,’ ‘get’ one of the popular etymologies frequent in Genesis; hence the mother’s words I HAVE GOTTEN A MAN ⇨ FROM THE LORD (KJV) is a rendering, following the LXX and vulg. Of ‘eth Yahweh, which is literally, ‘with Yahweh,’ and so UNINTELLIGIBLE here (the help of [RSV] is not in the Hebrew). It seems probable that ‘eth should be ‘oth, so, ‘the mark of Yahweh’ and that the words are a gloss...”

Another scholar: Clarke’s Commentary, volume 1, page 58, suggests a contextual problem with Genesis 4:1 as opposed to 1 John 3:12, and being aware the meaning of the Greek word “wicked” in this means “Satan” says the following: “...Unless she had been under Divine inspiration she could not have called her son (even supposing him to be the promised seed) Jehovah; and that she was not under such an influence her mistake sufficiently proves, for Cain, so far [remote] from begin the Messiah, was of the wicked on; 1 John 3:12...”

To show you that Aramaic was one of the languages spoken for that geographic area at the time of our Messiah, now quoting from “the World Book Encyclopedia,” © 1981, volume 1, page 551: “ARAMAIC...is an ancient Semitic language that was spoken throughout the Near East from about 700 B.C. to 700 A.D. Jesus spoke an Aramaic dialect. It was the popular tongue of Palestine at the time He lived. The books of Ezra and Daniel were written partly in the western dialect of Aramaic, Arabic finally took the place of Aramaic, except in a few isolated villages.”

Let's now observe from "Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary," page 167, how some scholars believe some passages in the New Testament are influenced by Targums: "Some New Testament writers indicate knowledge of targumic interpretation in their quotations from the Old Testament. For example, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay' (Romans 12:19; Hebrews 10:30) is a quotation from Deuteronomy 32:35; but it conforms neither to the Hebrew text nor to the Greek text of the Septuagint. This particular phrase comes from the Targum. Again, the words of Ephesians 4:8, 'When He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men,' are taken from Psalm 68:18. But the Hebrew and Septuagint texts speak of the receiving of gifts. Only the Targum on this text mentions the giving of gifts."

If there were no Targums in written form at that time, how could the New Testament writers have quoted from them?

Perhaps one of the more striking observations is made in a book entitled "Introduction To The Old Testament," by R.K. Harrison, pages 25 and 231. Here are two excerpts: "Quite aside from other considerations, there are numerous traces in the LXX of the influence of the Aramaic Targums, making the problem of the agreements between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX one of considerable complexity...It can be shown that many of the quotations of the New Testament writings were derived originally from an Aramaic source or sources, or perhaps even from oral translations, from memory, or from private translations..."

With this evidence, we can see that the Septuagint was affected by Aramaic Targums, the very same Targums which Ted R. Weiland claims are "Babylonian-influenced." If, then, the Aramaic Targums are unreliable, then, too, is the Septuagint. Further, if the Septuagint is unreliable, so, too, are our present day translations of the New Testament where they cite the Old Testament! In addition to this, there is a footnote at the end of chapter 42 of Job in the Septuagint which says this in part:

“This is translated out of a book in the Syrian language...” [Some designate Aramaic as Syrian].

If this is true, according to Weiland’s criteria, that makes the book of Job also “Babylonian-influenced.” As a Targum of Job written in Aramaic was found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, is confirmation the footnote at the end of Job in the Septuagint is probably correct, although we must reject the statement from the same footnote implying that Job was an Edomite who took an Arabian woman.

The Need For A Paraphrase (Targum)

When written material is translated from one language into another, some things cannot be expressed well in the secondary vocabulary. Thus, for a comprehensive understanding of the original language, sometimes an extensive paraphrase is required in the latter. This is particularly true when translating from Hebrew. In other words, without a paraphrase, much of the original meaning of the primary thought would be hopelessly lost. Therefore, it would have been impossible to translate the Hebrew into the Aramaic without paraphrasing to some degree. To have translated on a literal word for word basis would have left much of the meaning of the text wanting.

There is much more that could be presented concerning the Aramaic language in the Bible, but this will have to suffice for now. The subject is referred to as early as Genesis 31:46-47, where Jacob used a different name for a rock pile than Laban. Most think that Laban spoke in Aramaic and that Jacob spoke in Canaanite. As Laban had gone into paganism, it is easier to believe he was the one that spoke in Canaanite and Jacob spoke in Aramaic. With this, we can conclude that it is preposterous to repudiate all evidence found in the Aramaic Targums as being “Babylonian-influence.” Where is the old admonition that we shout “study to show ourselves approved?”

It must be understood that we are at WAR, and that does not refer to the war between the “spirit and the flesh” as the anti-seedliner do. Yes, there is a war

between the spirit and the flesh, and we will not discredit it in the least, but the WAR being spoken of is an entirely different conflict. The WAR between the “seed of the serpent” and the “seed of the woman.” How can anyone deny there are two seeds mentioned in Genesis 3:15? But deny it they do! They use some of the most fantastic arguments in an attempt to disprove that fact. Most anti-seedliners trace the bad fig “Jews” back to Esau, with which we will not disagree. But, if one will notice the various wives whom Esau married, one will discover they were mainly from the ten Canaanite nations of which the Kenites were a part Genesis 15:19. If one will check the Strong’s number for Kenite, one will see that it is #7017 and #7014. Then checking those numbers, they will be found to mean Cain, the one who murdered Abel. Now whether you believe that Satan or Adam was Cain’s father, scripture definitely proves that Esau’s children had Cain’s blood flowing in their veins. This fact is confirmed by Messiah Himself in Matthew 23:35. The very nature of Cain displayed itself in Doeg the Edomite killing 85 of Yahweh’s priests of the “linen ephod” at king Saul’s command, 1 Samuel 22:17-18. This leaves the whole matter dependent on Genesis 4:1 for which both the Massoretic and Septuagint texts are ambiguously obscure. Thankfully, we have a witness which is much more clear than the usual, accepted rendering of that verse, and which is contextually in agreement with the rest of scripture. Let’s take a look at it: “Targum of Jonathan on Genesis 4:1: “And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthy beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the Angel of the Lord.”

Whether or not we agree with this rendering depends on how badly we want to correlate this passage to correspond with, and measure up to the rest of The Word. If the anti-seedliners don’t accept this rendering, one would think they would at least recognize that the “Jews” are the descendants of Cain. They simply don’t believe their bible. They, therefore, demand that the Almighty accept their personally contrived dogmas and opinions on scripture. One such passage of Scripture the anti-seedliners take vehement exception to as proving Two Seedline doctrine is Matthew 13:24-30, 37-43 about the “wheat

and the tares.” While Stephen E. Jones and Jeffrey A. Weakley avoid comment on this topic, Lt. Col. Jack Mohr and Ted R. Weiland jump right in where angels fear to tread.

Before examining Matthew 13:24-30, 37-43, it would be advisable to read it: “Another parable put he forth unto them saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? From whence then hath it tares? He said unto them an enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn... He answered and said unto them, **HE THAT SOWETH THE GOOD SEED IS THE SON OF MAN. THE FIELD IS THE WORLD; THE GOOD SEED ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE KINGDOM; BUT THE TARES ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE WICKED ONE; THE ENEMY THAT SOWED THEM IS THE DEVIL;** the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

It’s simply fantastic the various interpretations the anti-seedliners put on this passage, most of which they have brought with them out of Jew-deo-unchristian churches and seminaries. Lt. Col. Jack Mohr, a vehement anti-seedliner, comments thus in the *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, page 15, concerning the words “tares” and “children” on this segment of scripture in

Matthew 13: “Apparently the disciples were intrigued by this parable, but could not understand its meaning. So Jesus explained it to them and told them that the ‘tares’ (#2215: ‘zizanian,’ a false grain called ‘darnel,’ which looks like wheat), were the ‘children of the wicked one.’ The word ‘children’ in Greek is (#5207: ‘hulos’ and means ‘immediate, remote or figurative kinship.’ So if the word can refer to ‘figurative kinship,’ why are the Seedliners so adamant in stating it means ‘literal kinship?’”

Had Lt. Col. Jack Mohr checked with the Thayer Greek-English Lexicon; The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament, by Spiros Zodhiates; or An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, by W.E. Vine instead of the limited definition found in Strong’s, he would have found the primary meaning for the word “children” #5207, means: “(A) A male offspring... (B) In a wider sense a descendant, pl. descendants, posterity.” (This definition is from Zodhiates, and the others agree)

There is a secondary figurative sense which can apply, for example: The disciples were called “sons of thunder.” Had Mohr read Strong’s more carefully, he would have noticed that it mentioned “immediate kinship” first. One’s immediate kinship would be one’s own son. Strong’s gave Mohr three choices, and he rejected the first two and implied that “figurative kinship” was the only one mentioned. Such a maneuver is hardly honest! It is apparent, Mohr already had his mind made up as to what he thought it should be. Secondly, Mohr forgets that Messiah Himself said “seed are...children.” Therefore, “seed” and “children” cannot be separated. Consequently, it is highly essential to find out what the word “seed” means. The Greek word for “seed” is #4690, and is sperma. This is where we get the English word “sperm.” According to Zodhiates, page 1304,

“Sperma...Also figuratively used of living being as the seed of man; i.e., of posterity or descendants.”

In this case “figuratively” means comparing man’s seed to agricultural seed, and that is exactly what this parable is doing in comparing Satan’s offspring to tares (darnel).

Thirdly, we must check out the one responsible for planting the darnel-like genetic people. In the parable of the wheat and tares the word “wicked” is #4190, and is used with the definite article “ho” in Matthew 13:19; Ephesians 6:16; 1 John 1:13-14; 3:12; 5:18, and means “Satan.” thus in 1 John 3:12 where it says: “Not as Cain, WHO WAS OF THAT WICKED ONE...”, it means exactly what it says, “Satan.” Further, the word “wicked,” #4190, in that same verse, according to Zodhiates, page 1198, is used with the definite article “ho,” and means: “...the evil one, Satan...”

The book Synonyms of the New Testament, by Richard Trench confirms what Zodhiates says about the word “wicked” (Greek #4190) on page 330: “Satan is emphatically no poneros as the first author of all the mischief in the world.”

In his Greek-English New Testament Lexicon, George Ricker Berry, page 82 describes ho poneros as “...the wicked one. i.e., Satan...”

W.E. Vine in his an Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words under “wicked” on Matthew 13:38 states: “...and in the following [verse just cited], where Satan is mentioned as ‘the (or that) evil one’...”

Another way to verify the “wicked” of Matthew 13:38 is speaking of Satan is to go to Matthew 13:19 where the same Greek word #4190 is used saying: “...then cometh the wicked one...” Then compare the parallel passage in Luke 8:12 which says: “...then cometh the devil...” Conclusion: the “seed” or “children” in Matthew 13:38 planted by the “wicked” one are the genetic offspring of Satan!

In his attempt to spiritualize and take figurative view of the “tares” in Matthew 13, Ted R. Weiland in his Eve, Did She Or Didn’t She? in a rebuff of a

quotation by James E. Wise, makes this statement: "Furthermore, if the seedliners' interpretation of the wheat and tares parable is accurate, and if the tares in Matthew 13 represent all the seed of Satan through Cain, then there is no alternative but to accept that the wheat represents all the physical seed line of Eve through Seth. The wheat in this parable depicts the sons of the kingdom, and by this interpretation, the wheat would automatically be sons of the kingdom by their heritage, that is, they would be saved by their race or lineage. If this is true, then Yahshua's death, burial and resurrection were wholly unnecessary. Of course, this hypothesis flies in the face of the entire Bible..."

Well, what do you know, except for the last two sentences, Weiland got something right! After all, Hebrews 12:8 says we are either "sons" or "bastards," and there is anything in-between. And all this bull manure about being "born again," (John 3:3), is totally an incorrect translation and interpretation. That verse is not saying "born again" but "born from above." Actually if one will check that verse out, it is saying one must be "born of the correct race." To show you this, we will investigate the meaning of the word "born" as used in John 3:3 which has the Strong's number #1080 in the Greek.

For this we will go to The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament, by Spiros Zodhiates, page 364. Zodhiates tells us this word means "generation, kind, offspring"...and the primary definition is: "Spoken of men, to beget"... "Spoken of women, to bear, bring forth"... "To be begotten"... "To be born as used generally..." In other words, when an Adamic White person is born in the flesh, he is also born of the Spirit. Other races are not "born" of that Spirit, nor can they ever be.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." (Ecclesiastes 12:7)

Zodhiates points out that “born” as used here (#1080) gennao, is from #1085, genos, which in turn means “offspring, posterity...family, lineage, stock...” You can also check this with Strong’s, but you must follow-through to #1085 to get the entire meaning. If you should check only the word #1080, gennao, you will not understand the full implications, for it is speaking of race. John 3:31 makes it clear there are “heavenly” people from above and people “that are of the earth...earthly...” Our redeemer told the Jews, John 8:23: “Ye are from beneath; I am from above: YE ARE OF THIS WORLD, I AM NOT OF THIS WORLD.”

Thus, like us, He was also born from above; i.e., of the White Race. We don’t want to leave the impression that we should not be converted though. It’s not a matter, as the Babylonian prostitute preachers imply, that one should “accept the Lord Jesus Christ as our personal Savior.” It’s not a question of whether we accept Yahshua, but whether or not He accepts us and calls us to be His servants. Inasmuch as He died two thousand years ago for our Redemption, He has already accepted us. To be truly converted, we must accept His Redemption, which brings about communion! Conversion does not consist of being “regenerated by the Spirit,” but of being “turned around” (an about-face). Where in the past we were “sinner” (breakers of Yahweh’s Law), we do a 180 and start, to the best of our ability, to keep His Laws. There are many who are reading this have experienced conversion. Whatever kind of prayer we made at that time, it was necessary for the Spirit to intercede on our behalf. (Romans 8:26) It’s only conjecture what kind of “groanings” of the Spirit might have “uttered,” but perhaps it might have gone something like this: “Here is an Israelite under the Covenant of Abraham who has come to the realization that he/she is a Lawbreaker and wishes to plead the blood of Redemption on his/her belief. He/she promises hereafter, based upon the light of the written Word, do his/her best to reject the leaven of the Pharisees, and to return to the faith of the Patriarchs.”

Don’t worry about the exact words you might have prayed at your conversion for the Spirit interceded and presented them before the Throne in an

appropriate manner. Also, don't distress yourself about all the members of your family in who were never converted. If they were not converted in this life, they will be in the next, for it is written: "...every [Adamic] knee shall bow to me, and every [Adamic] tongue shall confess to God." (Romans 14:11) Some of us Adamite-Israelites send our sins ahead to the judgment, while for other Adamite-Israelites, their sins will follow them to the Judgment. (1 Timothy 5:24) And that is no sign the latter are going to be assigned to a burning hell. They will be in the kingdom too. But aren't you glad you settled the account ahead of time?

To show you Ted R. Weiland is still holding the position on the parable of the wheat and the tares which he learned at his Christian Leadership College in Denver, Colorado, the following statement he made in his Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?, page 72: "Instead, this parable [of the wheat and tares] is simply contrasting righteous Israelites with wicked Israelites.."

To believe such a thing, Weiland is implying that agriculturally wheat has the same genetics as darnel. If, as he contends, the only difference between wheat and darnel are "righteous" and "wicked" Israelites, in essence he is claiming wheat and darnel (tares) are genetically identical. It would seem, with this conclusion, that Messiah is somewhat incompetent in presenting His teachings by way of parables. Or rather, could it be that Weiland is the one who is incompetent in understand them?!?! Yahshua said that He spoke in parables so some, the Jews, would not understand. For Yahshua never intended the Jews to be converted.

"For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; **LEST AT ANY TIME THEY SHOULD SEE WITH THEIR EYES, AND HEAR WITH THEIR EARS AND SHOULD UNDERSTAND WITH THEIR HEART, AND SHOULD BE CONVERTED, AND I SHOULD HEAL THEM.**" (Matthew 13:15)

The truth is, the wheat and tares are NOT genetically identical, and neither are the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman whom the wheat and tares represent. They may have had the same mother, but they surely had different fathers! By such spurious teachings as this, the one seedliners are doing more damage to Israel Identity than they are doing good! Sometimes it appears that these false teachings just might be deliberate and intentional. Jack Mohr gets his two cents worth in by saying in his *Seed of Satan, Literal or Figurative?*, page 15: "In no way does this Parable [of the wheat and tares] point to specific people by race, who are literal descendants of Satan, coming from his union with Mother Eve."

Moreover, on pages 15-16, Mohr has his own convoluted idea of what he thinks the parable of the wheat and tares is all about: "The 'tares,' those who disobey God's Law and refuse by the reapers, who will be 'angels,' not 'white Israelites, bent on vengeance'...This is one of the biggest problems with the Seedline people. They are more concerned with 'pulling up the tares,' whom they say are the Jewish people, then (sic, probably than) in getting their own house in order and their own Israelite people in a right relationship with God, so that He can do the 'rooting out work.' As a result, we find the Seedliners doing exactly what Yahshua warned them not to do, 'rooting up the wheat along with the tares...we can assure you from the Word of God, that when the 'rooting up' process takes place, there are going to be 'white Israelites' among the 'tares' who will be rooted up along with Yahweh's other enemies.'"

Two questions: Where in the Bible does Mohr get his evidence to substantiate these claims? Where is his verification this parable of the whet and the tares is not racial in nature? As already documented both the words #4690, "seed" and #5207, "children," mean "kinship" and "posterity." How much more racial can it be ??? Furthermore, if one will red some of Jack Mohr's other publications, one will find that he has a very peculiar position on race and talks out of both sides of his mouth on that subject. Remember, scriptures says: "A double minded man IS unstable in all his ways." (James 1:8)

Further evidence concerning the meaning of the term "seed" is found in The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, volume Q-Z, pages 328-329:

“SEED...is used to indicate both agricultural and human seed, the latter both in a narrow physical sense and as a description of the descendants of a common ancestor...the Israelite was commanded not to mix his seed in any field or vineyard, but to plant only one crop (Leviticus 19:19; Deuteronomy 22:9), a structure [critical remark] parallel to that regarding the mixture of human seed by intermarriage with other nations.” In the parable of the wheat and the tares, the common ancestor to the “wheat” is Seth, the son of Adam. The common ancestor of the tares is Cain, the son of Satan through Eve. While many commentaries address the topic of “tares,” a very good description for the term is given by The Westminster Dictionary Of The Bible, by Henry Gehman, page 591: “Tares. The rendering of Gr. Zizanion in Matthew 13:25-27, 29, 30 R.V. marg. Darnel. The tare (*Vicia Sativa*), a vetch, which pinnate and purple-blue or red papilionaceous flowers, would be easily distinguished from the wheat. The Gr. Word zizarion, which is probably of Semitic origin, corresponds to Arab. Zuwan., which denotes *Lolium*, and to Talmudic zonin. The bearded darnel (*Loium temulentum*) is a poisonous grass almost indistinguishable from wheat while the 2 are only in blade, but which can be separated without difficulty when they come into ear (cf. Vs. 29,30).” The poison from the “tares” is caused by a fungus.

“The darnel (tare) is host to an ergot-like smut fungus which infects the seeds. The fungus is a serious poison if eaten by animals or man.” (Pictorial Bible Dictionary, by Merrill C. Tinney, page 668)

From this description, we can easily apply the term “tares” to the “Jews.” You will notice that when the darnel (tare) comes into flower the colors are “purple-blue or red.” Because the “Jews” represent a few members of the Tribe of Judah who didn’t keep their bloodline pure, they would naturally appear as a counterfeit royal-blue, which in turn, serves to identify them with the tares. But the color red is even more significant, as it can represent Communism, for which the “Jews” are the inventors. Not only that, but it is the color of Esau from whom they also descend.

It is also the color of the “red dragon” of Revelation 12:3 which represents Herod, the “Jewish” Edomite-racial proselyte who attempted to murder the Emmanuel-child shortly after His birth. (For Herod’s father’s and mother’s lineage check Josephus’ Wars 1:6:2; 1:12:3; Antiq. 14:1:3; 14:8:1; 14:7:3; 14:12:1) Furthermore, the poison from the darnel (tare) seed would be representative of the poison; “leaven of the Pharisees” which Judeo-churchianity today is so infected with. Who says the “tares” don’t represent the “Jewish” people???

Della Stanley in her book *Adam’s Tree*, (1975) pages 170-173, puts it very nicely about the parable of the wheat and the tares at the end of chapter 34 and the beginning of chapter 35, entitled “Pharisees and Scribes— a Generation of Vipers.” We will quote excerpts from these few pages as a critical review in order to counter the anti-seedliners’ arguments:

“...Jesus gave the people another parable concerning wheat and tares. He compared the kingdom of heaven to a man that sowed productive seed in his field. But while his men or servants slept, an enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat. When the plants came up and brought forth fruit, the tares came up also. The servants wanted to go and gather out the tares, but the man said wait until harvest time. Then he instructed the reapers to gather the tares first (the rapture), and bind them in bundles to burn them; and gather the wheat into his barn. (Matthew 13:24-30) “...When Cain killed Able he was cursed and banished from the presence of God, and the curse was never lifted. And at this time the seed of man was divided into two groups: the descendants of Seth that replaced Abel which were the children of God; and the descendants of Cain which became the children of the devil.

“Generations later, Canaan, the son of Ham, was cursed. And the curse was never lifted, therefore his descendants became the children of the devil [by admixture with Kenites, Genesis 15:19]

“Nimrod was another descendant of Ham; and he built cities, among them Babylon. When the Israelites under Joshua pushed a portion of the

Canaanites out of the land of Canaan, they dispersed and some went to Babylon. Later still, there were the Shelanites, descendants of Shelah the son of Judah of the house of Jacob, whose mother was a Canaanite...neither were they allowed to rule through the house of Judah.

“The people that returned to Jerusalem from the sixth century B.C., captivity were NOT of the House of Israel, but were a remnant of the House of Judah. But it was the royal house of Zedekiah and his followers that god said, ‘I will deliver them to be removed into all kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a proverb, a reproach, a taunt, and a curse...’ it was mostly the members of Zedekiah’s house and his followers that intermarried with the cursed descendants of Canaan [which had also mixed with the Kenites, the descendants of Cain].

“After the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, there emerged a number of sects called the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Herodians, and the scribes...John the Baptist called these people a generation [race] of vipers. Jesus called them hypocrites and children of the devil; and cautioned His disciples to beware of their doctrine. He speaks of Satan and his kingdom in Luke 11:18...And everywhere He went the scribes and Pharisees followed and opposed everything that He did.

“There was quite a division among the Jews for the sayings of Jesus. Some believed and some did not. They came to Him and said, ‘How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.’ Jesus replied, ‘I have told you but you believe not...because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice...And follow me. And I give them eternal life...and I and my Father are one.’ (John 10:24-30) And the jews took up stones to stone Him...But Jesus said, ‘If God were your Father, then ye would love me: for I came from God...ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of you father ye will do...”

What Della Stanley failed to explain was: Of the two factions (one favoring diplomacy with Babylon; the other with Egypt), the house of Zedekiah favored the latter. After Nebuchdnezzr captured Zedekiah, and killing his seventy sons

and gouging out his eyes, the remainder of his surviving household forced Jeremiah to accompany them to Egypt for which he had forewarned them against. After Jeremiah sailed to Ireland with Tea Tephi, the remainder fell under the judgment of a third dying by the sword, A third by pestilence, and a third being captured and taken to Babylon. Actually, one small group ended up in Elephantine in Egypt where they built a temple after the fashion of Solomon's Temple (check Elephantine Papyri), and intermixing with African Cushite types (i.e., Sammy Davis Jr.) They became half-breed Falasha (black) "Jews."

You can't find a more rotten "bad fig" than that. How foolish then is Ted R. Weiland's remark, already quoted from his *Eve Did She Or Didn't She?*, page 72, but this time we will finish it: "Instead, this parable [of the wheat and the tares] is simply contrasting righteous Israelites with wicked Israelites, much the same as the good and evil figs of Jeremiah 24."

You can see from this, Weiland hasn't the slightest clue why the house of Zedekiah was considered "naughty figs." While Della Stanley did quite well, she should rather have linked the "bad figs" primarily with Elephantine in Egypt.

Because many incorrectly interpret Genesis 3:15 to mean a personal private war between one's spirit and one's flesh, I wish to cry out, urgently and loudly, to inform them the "enmity" spoken of in that passage is a "hate" WAR to the death between two different walking, talking breathing genetic family seedlines; and that "hate" was placed there by the Almighty Himself. Since the anti-seedliners willfully and arrogantly refuse to identify our enemy, they categorize themselves with those who "serve HIM not." The message is an invitation for disaster. Genesis 3:15 says "I WILL PUT," and our Maker never put "enmity" between our spirit and our flesh. Before making such an assertion, they should stop and think what they are accusing HIM of, for that makes HIM responsible for every sin man has committed and continues to commit. Furthermore, if the enemy can get us all wrapped up in ourselves,

and convince us that the only war we are fighting is a “spiritual war” between the spirit and the flesh, we won’t be of any use to the Almighty or to ourselves. With this paper we will expand where Ted R. Weiland foolishly tried to make it appear that the only difference between the “wheat and tares” of Matthew 13 were “righteous Israelites” and “wicked Israelites,” (see above) remarking in his *Eve, Did She or Didn’t She?*, page 72: “Instead, this parable (of the wheat and the tares) is simply contrasting righteous Israelites with wicked Israelites, much the same as the good and evil figs of Jeremiah 24.” It is evident that Weiland hasn’t the slightest clue to why Zedekiah and company were listed among the “naughty figs.”

We noted there were two factions at Jerusalem: one favoring diplomacy with Babylon; the other with Egypt, the house of Zedekiah advocating the latter. After Nebuchadnezzar captured Zedekiah, killing all his sons and gouging out his eyes, the remainder of that group forced Jeremiah, against his warning to accompany them to Egypt. Upon Jeremiah sailing to Ireland with Tea Tephi, they fell under the judgment of the sword, famine & pestilence.

Had he read and studied Jeremiah 24:8-9 thoroughly, he might have grasped the prophet’s true message regarding the “evil figs,” which says: “And as the evil figs, which cannot be eaten, they are so evil; surely thus said Yahweh, So will I give Zedekiah the king of Judah, and his princes, and the residue of Jerusalem, that remaining in the land, and them that dwell in the land of Egypt. And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for THEIR hurt, TO be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I shall drive them.”

In analyzing this passage, we see Jeremiah’s prophecy was directed at four categories:

- 1). Zedekiah and some of his household;
- 2). Is “princes” (better rendered “rulers”) under him;

3). The residue of Jerusalem, which included Hittites and Amorites, (Ezekiel 16:3-4) who had “confusion of face” (Ezra 9:1, 7) and were referred to as “wild grapes” (Isaiah 5:2), and

4). Them that dwell in Egypt.

The anti-seedline, antichrist, fellow travelers refuse to address these four categories in their proper context. Zedekiah was 32 years old when Nebuchadnezzar killed all his sons and gouged out his eyes, leaving him only daughters (the tender twigs of Ezekiel 17:22). Other than Tea Tephi and her sister, we are not told how many. The “princes” were simply the political and religious leaders under Zedekiah, not necessarily royal family members. After the campaigns of 605 and 596 B.C., by Nebuchadnezzar, and removal of the royal family of Jehoiachin along with 7,000 soldiers of Judah and their best craftsmen, only the poorest quality of people remained in Jerusalem.” (2 Kings 24)

Additionally, after Jerusalem was depleted of most of its population, nearby peoples moved into their empty homes as a refuge from Babylon thinking it safe after Zedekiah was appointed king by Nebuchadnezzar. Even during the kingship of Jehoiakim, after Nebuchadnezzar’s first campaign of 605 B.C., there were the Rechabites of Jeremiah 35:11, who moved into Jerusalem, descendants of the Kenites of 1 Chronicles 2:55 and Genesis 15:19, or “Cain’s bloodline.” In Joshua 15:63; Judges 1:19 and 2:2-3 we are told that Judah would not drive out the “inhabitants of the land” (Jebusites and others), and these would remain as THORNS and SNARES among them. Surely, they must have been part of the “residue” making up the “evil figs.” Then, we must remember the descendants of Shelah, the son of Judah by Shuah, the Canaanite. In addition, we must recall Solomon’s affairs with non-Israelite wives (1 Kings 11:1-9).

Undoubtedly he had descendants by those wives living in Jerusalem during Jeremiah's time (Nehemiah 13:26). The idolatry which manifested itself under all of Judah's evil kings originated with Soman's wives. Therefore, to believe that Jerusalem, as the antiseedliners proclaim, was made up of only pureblooded Israelites ("righteous" and "wicked") is only a Mickey Mouse, childlike, fairyland pipe-dream on the level of Alice in Wonderland or the Wizard of Oz. The fourth category classified as "evil figs" (Jeremiah 24:8) included "them that dwell in Egypt."

Two Elements in Jeremiah's Prophecy

While both Jeremiah 24:8-10 and 44:7, 12, 14, 26-30 seem to indicate that all the "evil figs" would die by the "sword," "famine" and "pestilence" at that time, on the other hand, both passages contain a clause that the "evil figs" would be driven into all the "nations" and "kingdoms" of the earth as a "proverb," "taunt" and a "curse." (Jeremiah 24:9; 34:17; 44:8) Therefore, it is evident these prophecies have both short and long-term fulfillment's. Matthew Henry's Commentary, vol. 4, pp. 564-565 comments on Jeremiah 24:9-10 thus: "Doubtless this prophecy had its accomplishment in the men of that generation; yet, because we read not of any such remarkable difference between those of Jeconiah's captivity and those of Zedekiah's, it is probable that this has a typical reference to the last destruction of the Jews by the Romans, in which those of them that believed were taken care of, but those that continued obstinate in unbelief were driven into all countries for a taunt and a curse, and so they remain to this day."

Rather, it was sifting-out of the racially impure.

The "Evil Figs" of Egypt

When first researching this topic, we were convinced that the party that forced Jeremiah to accompany them to Tahpanhes, Egypt, were those who eventually arrived and established a "Jewish" colony at Elephantine in Egypt.

However, this view will not hold water, for some Bible references such as the Pictorial Bible Dictionary, Merrill C. Tenney general editor, published by the Southwestern Company in 1966, on page 239, also holds that position.

Rather, it was mainly the “Jews who ‘returned from all nations’ to Jerusalem and attempting to go to Egypt, who worshiped the “queen of heaven,” who fell under the curse of the sword, famine and pestilence.

The Penguin Pictorial Historical Atlas Of Ancient Egypt says on page 120, under the topic “The Saite Monarchy:”

“...There is evidence of Greek commercial activity at Naukratis as early as 615 B.C., and during the reign of Amasis (570-626 B.C.) It was officially instated as the center of Graeco-Egyptian trade (partly, of course, to keep within direct royal control). Other Greek communities settled at Memphis and elsewhere, alongside immigrant Phoenicians and Jews.”

In this The Bible is History, page 168, Ian Wilson places some of the “Jewish” immigrants in Egypt contemporary with Judah’s evil king Manasseh. We will now present various documentation for this period: From the Eerdmans Dictionary Of The bible (2000), page 391, we get the following:

“ELEPHANTINE...PAPYRI, a large number of papyrus documents and fragments, written in Aramaic during the 5th century B.C.E., discovered at Elephantine, an island in the Nile River opposite Aswan (Biblical Syene) which became an asylum for Jewish refugees after the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem. (Cf. Jeremiah 43-44)

From The Tyndale Bible Dictionary by Elwell and Comfort (2000), under the same topic, pages 419-420: “ELEPHANTINE PAPYRI, Aramaic documents from the fifth century B.C., discovered at Elephantine, an island in the Nile River. At the time of the documents’ writing, Elephantine was a Persian military outpost, manned in part by a group of Jewish mercenaries with their families. The documents numbering over 100, belong primarily to three archives; two familial (family related) and one communal. The archives

contained many complete scrolls that were still tied and sealed at the time of their discovery, along with numerous broken papyri and fragments.

“The manuscripts are of considerable archaeological importance. Several centuries older than most of the Dead Sea Scrolls, they portray the social, political and religious life of a Jewish community outside Palestine. Several points of contact are made with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah...”

The world's greatest problem which has now been with us for over 7,000 years. We are confronted with this great issue every day of our lives, and we face it every direction we turn. Try as we may, it cannot be avoided. While we attempt to deal with this subject in a rational manner, there are hecklers on the sidelines ridiculing our efforts. They use every opportunity to belittle and mock the endeavors of those who expose the nature of the enemy. Top among these, at the present time, is Ted R. Weiland. Up until Weiland, Stephen E. Jones held first place. You may think it is not nice to point fingers and name names, but Ted R. Weiland in his book *Eve, Did She or Didn't She?* instructed me to point fingers. Let's see what he said on page 1: “If the seedliners' assessment of the events in the Garden of Eden can be proven scripturally correct, then no matter how unorthodox or unpopular this doctrine may be, we are duty bound as adherents of the Word of God to accept and teach it...Spiritual leaders are admonished by the Scriptures to address false doctrine, especially doctrine injurious to the gospel of Yahshua the Christ.” (Titus 1:7-14)

What Weiland had in mind with this passage was to use it to justify his own personally contrived point of view. This passage says in part: “Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.” That is exactly what we have been doing in this study. The anti-seedliner's position is totally irresponsible, and before we are finished, we will see how spurious their claim is.

Early in his book on page 2, Ted R. Weiland plays with words in an attempt to discredit the Two Seed doctrine of Genesis 3:15. Of the words he toys with, “fact, theory and hypothesis,” he settles on the latter. In his effort to play a

game with words, he forgets the most important element; that being to check his premise. It doesn't matter how many cunning words one might use, if the premise is not correct, the conclusion will be false. As we will see later, Weiland didn't check his premise.

Not only does Ted R. Weiland characterize the truth of Genesis 3:15 as being an hypothesis, he also accuses the Two Seedliners, page 2: "...who proceed to ignore clear textual intent, who disregard the principles of Hebrew and Greek idioms and the rules of consistency, and who assume a literal interpretation of clearly non-literal statements."

If anyone is disregarding Hebrew and Greek, it's Ted R. Weiland! He disregarded the Greek when he scoffed at John 8:44 where our Savior said directly to the 'Jews,' "Ye are of your father the devil." The Greek word for the word "of," in that case, meaning "sons of a father," as already covered above. In addition to his charge that we disregard the principles of Hebrew and Greek, Weiland accuses the Two Seedliners of misinterpreting literal and non-literal Hebrew and Greek idioms. Then on page 3, Weiland says: "However, as Bible students already know, there are no scriptures that expressly teach any of these false conclusions."

Inasmuch, as he demands the Scriptures to teach "expressly," is proof positive that Weiland himself has a total disregard for Hebrew and Greek idioms concerning Two Seedline doctrine, or any other doctrine. Again, he makes the same allegation on page 7 where he says, "If these statements were true, certainly god would have inspired His writers to warn His people of these dangers somewhere in the Bible."

Weiland evidently forgets that Matthew 13:34-35 says: "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet..."

SPEAKING IN PARABLES IS HARDLY SPEAKING "EXPRESSLY." This is why Ted R. Weiland has a total disregard for the parable of the **WHEAT AND**

TARES in Matthew 13, as he demands it to be rendered “expressly.” Not only did Yahshua speak in parables, but all the prophets did likewise. So, if Weiland expects the Scriptures to be “explicit,” he is under a voodoo induced hallucination. It seems, whether a Scripture is literal or non-literal, depends on how the all-wise Weiland interprets it. Is that “REBUKE” sharp enough? (Titus 1:13) It also appear, according to his book on page 1, that he is the only one authorized to give a “rebuke!”

<http://www.thechristianidentityforum.net>